

THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine published at 13 Rue Calvin, Geneva
by the World's Student Christian Federation

Dr. W. A. VISSER 't HOOFT *Editor*

VOLUME XXVI

Second Quarter, 1933

NUMBER 2

EDITORIAL

The Christian and the Nation — by bringing together these two words, two meanings are suggested. Either an attempt to define the Christian's duty to his country, to his people, to the state of which he is a citizen, the responsibility of the individual towards the collectivity of which he is naturally a part; or an attempt to put the Christian on his guard against the excesses of his own patriotism, to warn him that he must preserve his spiritual independence in face of the ever-increasing demands of the modern state. In brief: duty to the nation may be regarded as positive or negative. Both these interpretations are permissible. For the Christian cannot detach himself from his historical and social environment; further, he must recognise that this environment has a significance for God, and therefore demands special obedience from him. But on the other hand, he cannot allow this environment to become an absolute — he cannot let his particular duty as a citizen precede his general duty as a member of the Kingdom of God.

But because both these interpretations are permissible, from the Christian point of view — and in practice this often happens — it is possible to accept one interpretation to the exclusion of the other, and thus — consciously or unconsciously — to distort the problem. This is the case with the "nationalist", in the strong sense of the term, or of the Christian anarchist, whether extremist or moderate. What makes discussion between representatives of these two tendencies very difficult, even well-nigh impossible, is that each representative is thinking of only one aspect of the problem, and — since this aspect is legitimate

and Christian — his conscience is thus appeased, although his religious attitude remains false.

It is essential to regard the problem always from the two aspects at once, and to perceive that these two Christian duties entail a conflict of duties. God and Caesar (who is ordained by God) may come into opposition. The loyalty which we owe to the country in which God has placed us may contradict our loyalty to God the Father of all men, the Father of all nations.

*
* * *

The Christian's first task is, never to forget that there exists here a conflict between duties — no imaginary conflict, but a real and vital one. Hence the Christian must accept spiritually the moral and religious tension in which he has to live; he must not be satisfied with an easy solution of the problem and thus avoid coming to a general, theoretic and abstract solution.

In the second place, in the light of the divine Revelation, he must consider the principles implied in these two obligations.

This number of *The Student World* would like to help to clarify the study of this question by pointing out the different underlying principles.

The first question is, that of the religious significance of the nations. Does God want them? How and for what purpose does He want them? Are they ordained by the Creator, as the family for instance? Or are they the outcome of sin, which has brought division among men; and is God merely tolerating them until the day when He will abolish them, in order to reunite all people and all races in the unity of the Kingdom of God? Are they an absolute factor of our creation, or an accidental phenomenon? This is the problem treated by M. C. Slotemaker de Bruine in its most general aspect: the "Order of Creation." By bringing the nation into line with the other human relationships, he helps us to discover its purpose and value.

But it is not enough to establish the position of the nation — large or small, absolute or relative — in regard to the Will of God. We must know how to recognise this position, how to obey the divine vocation inherent in the collectivity, in which we are

placed at birth. Is it by obeying it unreservedly, in every instance; or is it by refusing obedience in certain cases, so that we no longer heed the nation in questions, which we believe to be contrary to the Will of God for the nation itself? This is the problem of the Christian's attitude to war, for example. For the conscientious objector is not necessarily, as some accuse him of being, an individualist, who in the name of Christian conscience holds himself aloof from his sinful nation. He has the right to declare himself even more definitely a part of his country, at the moment when he disobeys the state, especially if he has to pay for his disobedience by suffering; for he is seeking his country's truer loyalty to the divine will. The forms and limitations of this obedience are dealt with in most of the articles in this number, especially those by H. Lilje, C. Westphal and E. Radl.

There remains another question, raised especially by A. Philip: that of the specific historical duties incumbent on a particular nation at a given time. If the nations are really ordained by God, their development must have a concrete significance, which is modified and evolves. The duty of the Christian is modified at the same time. In other words, duties may be compulsory at one epoch, being absolute commandments of God and yet relative to a given period; these same duties were perhaps not true yesterday, and may not hold good tomorrow.

It is the duty, not only of the Christian, but of the Christian community — seeking, studying and praying together — to discover this special vocation, this mission of our generation. At the paradoxal time in which we are living, in which every nation is tending to make itself absolute, and every patriotism is tending to become a "nationalism" and thereby to prepare for the destruction of the nations by military or economic war — at this time does not the true Christian duty to the nation consist in denouncing and refusing this absolutism? And is it not the Federation's mission to help its members to a better understanding and fulfilment of this duty? That is the problem facing us in many of the signs of the times. We shall not solve it through theories about the nation, but through the attitude which each one of us adopts towards his country.

P. M.

There are two innovations in this number. First of all, the Reader's Notes. As far as space allowed, we have included some quotations which seemed particularly suggestive, most of them being borrowed from contemporary works on the subject treated in this number. We leave these articles without comment, believing that the opinions expressed therein will help readers of The Student World in their personal thinking.

Dr. Visser 't Hooft is starting a section entitled The Editor's Diary, in which he will analyse in each number some of the outstanding events in the life of the Federation.

The Christian and the Nation

Hanns LILJE

The problem of the Christian's attitude to the nation is not a single practical question in Christian life ; like all the problems of its kind, if we take it seriously it brings us back to the very bases of our Christian faith and life. A question which is today preoccupying so many nations in an important chapter of their history cannot leave Christianity unaffected ; and even if grave differences should exist in our understanding of this problem, we ought to make every possible effort to see each other's point of view. It must not concern us whether *we* are right in the end, but whether God's Will is recognised and confirmed in this realm of life also.

I.

The Meaning of the Conception of the " Nation ".

A special difficulty in our understanding is the fact that the idea of the nation has a very different meaning in the different parts of the world. From the *scientific* aspect one can distinguish the following main conceptions of the national idea. The *ethnological* conception looks for the distinguishing attributes of the nation in the external, natural suppositions about the people : race, blood, etc. *Rationalist* thought sees the nation principally or exclusively as a community of aim, which has united for economic and other practical reasons. Finally the *romantic* school looks back at the history of the people and through it learns to understand the essence of the nation. Besides these scientific differences, there exist far-reaching practical differences in the understanding of the idea of " nation " in the different countries. One need only recall how differently the idea of " nation "

has been conceived in the Central European countries and in Switzerland, or even more in the United States of America. Perhaps the historical problem is not fully realised in North America ; the frontier-problem, the fate which cramps together in an almost insoluble community the Central European nations, is only theoretically known over there. We shall here base our discussion on the historical conception of the nation. This includes two different things : 1. The natural foundation of a national life among the people ; 2. The civic formation of this people in a common historical destiny.

In the present situation direct attention must be drawn to the crisis affecting our ideas of the " nation ". From the point of view of world history, it must be recognised that the idea of the state is everywhere in a critical condition, which may have far-reaching effects on politics. From the point of view of cultural history, the humanistic conception of the state is breaking up. Hence the question is one which fills a broad framework of history, and goes far beyond immediate distinctions between democracy and monarchy, between nationalism and internationalism. From this may be drawn two clear, methodical deductions. Two typical Christian errors must be avoided : that of completely rejecting every conception of nation and state on the one hand, and on the other that of overhastily putting Christianity on the same footing as a definite conception of nation and state. Instead of this, two decisive questions must be answered : 1. What relations have the nation and state to God ? 2. What conclusions may we draw from this, as regards the Christian's attitude to the nation ?

II.

The Relation of the Nation to God; (the Christian Analysis of Nation and State).

To answer this question, let us go back to the ideology of Early Christianity. Of course, the return to the New Testament is not to mean a naive fundamentalism ; it means that the real Christian understanding of the fundamental

laws of life must be re-discovered, through a careful study of the New Testament message. Early Christianity has expressed its ideas on state and nation in the following fundamental principles. The Bible begins on the assumption that the existence and variety of the different nations are willed by God. Hence it cannot be claimed that any form of "internationalism", which denies the individualism of the nations is essentially Christian. The prophets of the Old Testament, the Apostles of the New, assert too clearly that the variety of the nations is in accordance with the Will of God. (e.g. Amos 9, 7; Acts 17, 26). But neither can it be claimed that the existence of the different nations is an "Order of Creation"; if by the "Order of Creation" is meant an original ordinance of God, the existence of the nations cannot be explained by this theory. The warning of the Tower of Babel story stands out too clearly. But what the Bible says, without these modern ideas, is clear enough: different nations do exist; to recognise that belongs to the recognition of reality as God has willed it. Indeed we cannot speak of the biblical conception of nationality without pointing out the three restrictions of the divinely-willed diversity of the nations. The first is the unity of the human race, as originally created (Acts 17, 26); that is an idea which cannot be abandoned, if we wish to accept the Gospel behest to preach to the whole world, and if we wish to remain faithful to the One Holy Christian Church which we confess in the Third Article. This is even more true of the second limitation — the unity of God's children in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3, 28). A man like Paul definitely realised that this unity was no mere synonym for a magnificent vision of a politically united world. One can clearly distinguish Paul's ideas from the rapture with which a man like Polybios, at the same period, rhapsodised over the great political unity of the Roman Empire. The *Oekumen* is something different from the International, in any of its forms. But the third limitation is the sharpest and most clearly-defined: all citizenship is finally suspended by the expectation of Christ's second coming; for "our citizenship is in heaven" (Phil. 3, 20). This does away with the idea that the nation

is an "eternal" value — an idea clearly expressed by as patriotic a man as the Swiss, Gottfried Keller, in one of the most beautiful passages in his novels.

If by reason of these indications we let ourselves be influenced by the biblical conception of the nation, one thing becomes immediately apparent: the biblical conception seems hardly sufficient for our present purposes. At any rate it seems to pass too hastily over a question which is so important for us today — the idea of nationality. This impression is a true one. Indeed, it says nothing about some very essential relationships which we are obliged to face today. Yet this biblical conception of the nation contains a most definite statement: the idea of the nation must be related to God. God wants nations to exist. He wants it with quite definite limitations; but in recognising these limitations, I realise that I really want to remember God in this connection. But when I have really understood that the idea of nation must be related to *God*, I find myself in the sharpest opposition to the typical political thought of the moderns.

The distinction becomes sharper if we investigate the biblical ideas on the *State*. The Bible's pronouncements on the state — which are, strange to say, much more pregnant than those on the nation — go in two apparently opposite directions. On the one hand the origin and influence of the state seem at first to stand in opposition to God (e.g. I. Sam. 8; Matt. 17, 26; John 19, 11; Col. 3, 11; Gal. 3, 28; etc.). Men ought to be able to live without the state, and to remain immediately under the rule of God. But they cannot, because they are dominated by the power of evil. That is why the state takes the place of God. But side by side with this line of thought we find in the Bible another: God *wants* the state to replace Him. This comes out most clearly in the respect paid to rulers. That the "powers that be" are fundamentally ordained by God (Rom. 13), that one should even pray for those in authority (I. Tim. 2, 2) is certainly the strongest assertion of civic authority that one can imagine. But it is just at this point that misunderstandings are particularly liable to arise, although the nature of

the biblical ideas ought to make misunderstandings impossible. For there can be no question of anything like a state-absolutism being furthered or made possible through this strong assertion of civic authority. It should not be interpreted as an overrating of civic authority, because it is made perfectly clear why a state must exist : on account of the order of sinful reality. The Reformers have expressed it adequately on the lines of Romans 13 : the state is given to us "for discipline and repentance". In its positive biblical valuation it is the continual reminder that God's Will is supreme, but that mankind would not be able by themselves to live according to God's commands, and that therefore the state, as God's representative, preserves the divine order of life on earth. In its positive significance the state reminds one in the biblical sense of the two barriers by which humanity is hemmed in : on one side the weakness of man, who cannot live and form his life by his own will, but needs commandments which are beyond and above him ; and on the other side the state reminds one of its own finite nature ; for when we no longer need the state — according to an idea of Luther's — the Kingdom of God will have been perfected on earth. But for the present "we are subject to the world."

The Christian answer at the present day must, therefore, keep in mind two fundamental ideas. On the one hand such an answer must be clearly aware of the difficulty and relativity of the whole question. The variety of interpretations of the idea of "nation" or race show how unexplored the whole field still is today in the scientific sense, and how cautious and reserved any judgment must be. On the other hand the Christian attitude, owing to the foregoing New Testament ideas, will regard nation and state as *the divine order for a sinful world*. This is equivalent to saying that, even in Christendom, nation and state possess a relative value. They cannot simply be rejected — that would be unbiblical enthusiasm — but they must be regarded as a great gift of God on earth. The Christian certainly knows that nation and state are surpassed by the *ecclesia universalis*, which we confess in the faith.

III.

The Attitude of the Christian to the Nation; (the Christian Analysis of the Political Ethic).

The Christian's first task is, therefore, to recognise the *relative* importance of nation and state. A complete rejection of both is therefore un-Christian, because it is unrealistic. Nation and state belong to the earthly organisations which are given to us, and which the Christian cannot arbitrarily discard. This recognition of the relative significance of nation and state is especially important in two ways : it expresses the fact that the state can demand obedience in personal matters. Moreover, from the Christian standpoint, on certain conditions the state can demand that we lay down our lives. The Christian must object that pacifism, as a philosophy of life, is fundamentally a denial of the idea of the state and must therefore be rejected as unrealistic. The fact that in the present political situation war must be avoided at all costs, because it would be disastrous for the nations, goes without saying for political reasons, and needs no philosophical argument. As to nationalism, we must realise that the nation can only demand the sacrifice of one's life, if it recognises a higher authority, in whose name this order may be enforced.

The Christian's second task is to protest against the absolutism of nation and state. In making nation and state into absolute values, two basic facts are usually overlooked : one forgets that states are only of temporary duration ; and one forgets that the commonwealth of nations is only possible if they show consideration for one another.

The Christian's third task is the unconditional willingness for personal sacrifice, for service. It is in this way that he expresses the fundamental law of political action. Real devotion and real service mean *sacrifice* and not destruction of life. Just as suicide is far from being the right interpretation of Jesus' words, (John. 12, 25,) " He that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal ", so the mere

negation or contempt of the state is far from being the right explanation of the Christian command, that the state must be founded on sacrifice. But for the Christian there is no real devotion, even towards nation and state, which is not at the same time devotion to God, the Lord of life. Hence the Christian cannot take part in any civic task which may not be regarded as service to God. And lastly, real devotion and real sacrifice are only possible, when the Christian bears in mind that also in political life he is living in a sinful order, and that he therefore needs the forgiveness of sins through Jesus Christ and the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Only by realising this will Christendom avoid the great danger of one Christian despising another, because he takes a different attitude in political life.

The Christian's fourth task in political life consists in taking a reserved attitude in politics; for there can be no doubt that sin is at work in all human relationships, deforming God's original creation. Above all, he can never entirely lose sight of the evanescent nature of political life. "It is the thought of a *vita futura* which enables the Christian to do his duty in a hard world" (Brunner).

Reflection on the Christian attitude to nation and state shows especially clearly that we cannot master life unless we possess a fundamental knowledge of God's Will. Without this recognition of God's Will we are working in the dark. At the same time it becomes apparent how varied the Christian theories on fundamental questions may be. But in whatever direction our Christian reflection may lead us, and whatever course we may adopt, we have only the one message to proclaim — that of the One God, Who is and remains the One Lord of the earth.

Cæsar and God

Charles WESTPHAL

This has been a perennial problem, ever since it presented itself to the conscience of the first Christians, who, although they were Roman subjects, refused to sacrifice to Cæsar. "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world", said Jesus, "but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil". From the very beginning the Christian has had to struggle against this twofold temptation: to escape from the world in order to be preserved from evil; or to remain in the world and become subject to it. We are always coming up against this problem, and the nation being what it is today, the problem has become more and more difficult. It has become a commonplace to denounce the nationalisms of today. But it is not enough to point out the paganism of these nationalisms; one is obliged to live in the nation in some consistent way. The nation has become the most exacting of collectivities; it is undoubtedly the only one for which we can be called upon to die. Can the Christian accept or reject this blind discipline; can he reconcile his duty as a citizen with his duty as a Christian? I must confess at once, that I have no clear and definite answer to this question. When Visser 't Hooft asked me to study this subject, I replied: "I shall bring you nothing but doubts...". He said, "That will be useful all the same". If my own doubts saved you from hasty, superficial, self-satisfied conceptions that would certainly be worth while. But I ask you not to expect anything but the witness of a man, who was eighteen when war broke out in 1914, who discovered almost at the same time the reality of God and of the Motherland, who fought without remorse (though not painlessly) and yet without hatred, and who has been torn ever since that time by his effort, not "to serve two masters", but to "render to

Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's ”.

I.

First of all, let us examine things from the point of view of Cæsar. What is the nation, what is its origin, in what direction has it developed ?

The different nations of which our world is composed offer infinite variety to the historian, the geographer, and the psychologist. Still, their common origin is — interest. Socrates said : “ Is not the source of society to be found in the powerlessness of each individual to be self-sufficient, and the need which he feels for many things ? Let us imagine a state, it is obviously our needs which will be its foundation.”

Interest alone, however, although it is the origin, is not sufficient to constitute a real nation. Other elements come in : race, language, geographical features, religion. But the basis of a nation is a common *will* : Rousseau says, “ One must always go back to a first covenant.” This *will* gradually assumes self-consciousness ; the nation is moulded by historical events, and in the so-called highly-developed nations there develops a rational, sentimental and even spiritual justification of the nation in its existing form. To Renan, the worthy heir of the 18th century in France, and of the ideology of the Revolution, a nation is a *spiritual principle*, a unit based on a long past of effort and devotion and sacrifice, and which “ is summarised in the present by a tangible fact : *agreement* — the clearly-expressed desire to continue the common life. The existence of a nation is.... a daily plebiscite.”

This conception is not lacking in grandeur, but it does not take into account the whole existence of nations. There is a certain amount of chance and of violence in the origin of many nations. Looking back into the past, every nation will find, side by side with evidences of a confirmed and united will, times when this will was trampled down and broken. There are many minorities whose existence is something quite different from a daily plebiscite, and whose national

sentiment is increased tenfold by oppression. Hence another justification for the nation must be found. Some men have looked for it on a plane superior to human will, and have found it in a mysticism of the state. To Hegel the state is the universal reality resulting from the necessities of economic organisation ; it is the stage when the spirit finds its " objective liberty " ; it limits the arbitrariness of the individual will, and leads the individual (who is always apt to be self-centred) to " the life of the universal substance."

These are no mere dead speculations. Hegel's conception lives on in the doctrine of Fascism, as Mussolini has just formulated it in the Italian Encyclopedia : " Everything is contained in the state ", he writes, " and nothing human or spiritual exists, much less has any value, outside of the state. In this sense Fascism is all-inclusive...." It is comprehensible that Pope Pius XI should protest against this all-inclusiveness ! On the other hand the conception of Renan is the soul of French nationalism today. For it must be realised that true French nationalism does not rest on weak conservatism within the country, but on the democratic ideology of the Armed Nation, which we derive both from the 18th century philosophers and from the armies of the Revolution.

(I speak only of the Latins, leaving the Anglo-Saxons, the Germans, the Slavs to explain their own nationalisms. The Christian is more aware of his own faults than of those of others.)

Many Frenchmen (not necessarily Christians) oppose nationalism by claiming the freedom of the human spirit. For instance, Benda declares the will of men, which affirms itself in nationalism, to be a form of evil : " The nation frankly declares itself a secular affair " and it is the duty of thinking people (*clerics*) to have nothing to do with this contemptible temporal world. To this social nihilism Daniel Halévy opposes a lofty, reasonable wisdom : " Let us hold ourselves ready to give what is asked of us, our lives or our possessions. But let us be free.... The confusion of patriotism and hatred is a modern thing...." Others, in order to safeguard the universal spiritual values, refuse to submit

to any national discipline, like a Félicien Challaye, who would allow a foreign invasion rather than take part in war. Finally, the most current attitude is that of an idealistic internationalism, which is anxious to preserve the rights of every nation — if necessary by force — but at the same time tries to submit all national interests to the general interest. Montesquieu expresses this sentiment in a famous phrase : “ If I knew of something which would benefit myself at the expense of my family, I would reject it. If I knew of something which would benefit my family but not my country, I would try to forget it. If I knew of something which would be useful to my country at the expense of Europe, or useful to Europe at the expense of the human race, I would regard it as a crime.”

This is what I call “ Cæsar’s point of view ” — the nation as seen by the man, the citizen. How will the Christian, the super-natural man, fit into this economy ?

II.

The Christian feels (and quite rightly) that he must relate everything to God. For him there is no justification for the existence of the nation unless it has a divine origin. Even in ancient times, every people had its god.... Léon James writes : “ No explanation of nature is complete, except in relation to a divine plan. Indeed all the criticisms directed against the idea of the nation are valid, if we try to justify it by nature alone. For the man who has some share in the divine purpose, except in God, integral national consciousness is an unrealisable myth. Everything becomes clear if the nation — the ‘ spiritual principle ’ on the human plane — exists above this plane yet in contact with it, in accordance with the divine purpose. The nation is the saving thought of God, suited to a certain stage, and affecting a certain order of human activities both physical and spiritual.” Considered thus “ the nation exists primarily in God, Who through it has predestined me to certain forms of existence.”

This is certainly a coherent doctrine, but is it authentically Christian ? I must admit that the biblical revelation is not

at all clear on the subject, because it contains so many different conceptions. First of all, in the Old Testament there is the prophetic conception of the chosen people, whose God will be the God of all the nations — all called to be, as it were, moral beings, to be guided, punished or rewarded by God. Side by side with universalism, there is an admirable prophetic patriotism, which consists in a passionate love of one's country, a longing for it to be holy as God wills, and in judging it with an uncompromising moral loyalty. But although this may apply to a chosen people, can it be demanded of the nations today? How can a nation be called to holiness, when it is not animated by a common faith?

At the other extreme there is the apocalyptic expectation of Christ's second coming: "The Church", writes Abbé Journet, "can only be compared with the Virgin, bearing within her the King of the world, for whom the inns at Bethlehem had no room. That will not last for ever; there will be a conclusion — the agony or the end of the old world."

And between the two — Jesus Christ, the only perfect revelation. But on the problem before us, Jesus is absolutely silent. He loved His people, "the sheep of Israel" and wept over Jerusalem. But He accepted the yoke of Cæsar. After Him, Paul recommended submission to the civic authorities as being "ordained of God" (Romans 13). Are we to suppose that Jesus simply accepted the teaching of the prophets, and considered it unnecessary to add anything further? This seems to me pure hypothesis, and I think Renan was right in writing: "For a long time we have accustomed ourselves to say, that the Gospel contains principles of political liberty, and this banal phrase has been complacently repeated over and over again. It would be very difficult to quote a single passage of the Gospel, which contains the slightest germ of the political system adopted by the nations today. Every high-minded person must regard this sublime book with admiration, but not to the point of discovering things in it which do not exist. The principal of the Gospel is the moral and religious idea, the perfection and purification of the inner man. Undoubtedly

the respect for humanity, inspired by such a doctrine, must lead to worthier political methods. This happy result is a consequence. But the only political passage, which can be quoted from the Gospel, is superior in its indifference : ‘ Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s’ (Matt. 17, 21) ”.

Rousseau felt quite rightly, that nothing is as contrary to the social spirit as the Gospel. Jesus has only one family, which consists of “ those who do the will of His Father ”. There is only one *Christian* society, and that is the Church — the supernatural society which will henceforth be the soul of a new humanity, outside the framework of all the nations.

Before going further, and before deciding what is the duty of the Christian, we must therefore clear up the problem of the relations between the Church and the state. Will not the attitude of the individual Christian be a part of the attitude of the Church ?

But how can such a vast problem be discussed in a few words ? History has seen the Church assuming temporal power, and the state assuming spiritual power, each in their turn — both situations being fraught with danger.... Today the state is more powerful than the Church ; the Church and the state are becoming more and more separated, but the Church is undoubtedly the only force capable of checking the modern state’s claim to absolute sovereignty. In the Roman Catholic conception, the state has its origin in the order of nature ; but nature belongs entirely to the creation and must be sanctified. The natural order is therefore subordinated to the supernatural order, and the state, which answers to the essential needs of man, must be controlled, if not inspired, by the Church. A group of Catholic theologians, which met in consultation at Fribourg, has just published the following statement : “ The theories of state sovereignty, vulgarised by numerous jurists and politicians today, are far from agreeing with the ideas of reason or those of the Christian tradition. They usually regard the state as absolute. It is fully autonomous. There is no means

of appeal, as to whether its actions are wrong or not. It knows no obligations, except those to which it has freely consented. The only limitations and laws which it recognises are found in its own desire for power. Moreover, on the pretext that the state must satisfy all the needs of human life, these doctrinaires endow it with an inner dynamic, in virtue of which political sovereignty tends to invade the sphere of economy, culture and even of religion, which are all regarded as exclusively national.

“ In the eyes of the Christian philosophers, the sovereignty of the state is something quite different. They conceive of it as the moral power exercised by the state in choosing the best means for the common weal of its citizens. They regard state sovereignty as the manifestation of a freedom of initiative exercised in the administrative order by the state towards its citizens. But since the state is essentially a social entity, and outside the human community is powerless to secure the common weal, which is its own aim, Christian philosophers conclude that its *external* sovereignty could not be synonymous with unconditional independence, but that it does also express a liberty : that of choosing methods of organisation, technical procedure, the juridical or political institutions most adapted to bring about international well-being.”

Hence it is the duty of citizens... “ in international relations to propagate the true doctrine of the natural and supernatural Ethic, so that accurate appreciations may be proposed from school-time on, and so that the falsity may be proved of the current theories which are widespread today, regarding the political sovereignty or the economic hegemony of a state or nation, and regarding the natural election of one race to dominate the world.”

Here again we are faced by a doctrine which seems coherent. How is it that it does not satisfy us entirely ? It is because it remains vague on the subject of the duty of the citizen ; having recognised the duality in which he has to live, it does not specify the limits of his double loyalty — national and Christian. Jesus has said nothing on the

subject ; the teaching of the Church is excessively prudent ; who will tell us " what place the nation occupies in the scale of different values " and what sort of loyalty we owe to it ? Who will tell us if it is legitimate, and in what cases, to defend spiritual values by force ? Who will tell us how our consciences may reconcile the necessary national discipline with moral independence ? Who will show us the steep but sure " upper road " between the absurd and impious denial of the nation, and the equally absurd and impious worship of it ?

III.

In conclusion I shall confine myself to two points :

1. *The Divine Origin of the Nation.* Genesis tells us (2, 1-9) that at the time when men still all spoke the same language, they wanted to build a city and a tower " to make themselves a name ", i.e. to replace the name of God, to be masters of their own destiny (as Adam had wished to be master of knowledge). But God through the confusion of tongues, divides and scatters them.

The existence of the nation is a punishment, a permanent obstacle to man's pride. The nation is a human group, and, like everything that is human, it is corrupt ; through the nation we are, to our humiliation, separated from mankind as a whole. If God has willed it thus, is it not because He wishes to teach us that there will be no unity among us except *supernatural* unity ?

But God in His mercy raised up a holy people, in which we see what every nation should become. The nation is " a saving thought of God " in the sense, that this imperfect body must first be humbly accepted, then ransomed and transfigured.

Man will not be saved without his body, nor without his country.

Thus the story of the Tower of Babel seems to me to have a social significance analogous to the individual significance of the story of Eden. The same sin — pride, the desire to be one's own master. The same punishment : henceforth

we have a corrupt body, but one which may still be ransomed and become "the Temple of the Holy Spirit"; in the same way we are living in a corrupt social order, but one which is still capable of salvation.

2. But we are living in a pagan world, which will not be "christianised" by any five-year plan. The Christian may adopt one of two attitudes. I will call the first the "escape through holiness". It is the attitude of the monk, the conscientious objector, the apocalyptic pietist. I do not say "escape" in any depreciatory sense; I am quite prepared to agree with Jacques Maritain when he writes: "Today the devil is so busily at work in the order of life, that the world will soon become uninhabitable except for saints. The rest of humanity will sink under despair, or fall to the condition of submen. The paradoxes of human life are too intense, the weight of matter is too heavy; merely to exist, one has to expose oneself to too many pitfalls. Some day Christian heroism will be the only solution of life's problems. Then, since God gives His grace according to our need, and tempts no one beyond his strength, we shall doubtless see an unusually flourishing period of spiritual life, side by side with the very worst epoch of human history."

The second attitude consists in accepting a *compromise*; it is a painful word to use, but it is the only one which *honestly* meets the case. The Christian has to live in the world, and he is not of the world. There will always be a conflict in him between his duty to the world and his duty to God. His first duty is to see the compromise loyally and to follow it out to its logical conclusion, but *without any illusions* as to the value of his actions. As André Philip writes in his article in this number: "In this task the Church ought constantly to stimulate the Christian, and show him the evil of certain moral attitudes"... The Church should clarify his spiritual vision, so that in moments of discouragement he can take up the struggle without spiritually *accepting* the compromises to which he is forced to submit."

On the one hand the escape through holiness; on the other the "tension" of compromise. Must we choose between

these two attitudes ? They are both Christian, they are both necessary. The truth is, that there is no *one* Christian attitude, nor one *purely* Christian attitude. Our faith is manifested only through our mind and flesh, and each of our loyalties brings to the world a part of the truth, which is only made perfect in Christ.

In regard to the demands of national law, an attitude of aloofness solves nothing, but forces citizens and Christians to do the necessary thinking. On the other hand, the Christian who accepts civilian loyalty restricts himself to action which is slow and beset with pitfalls, but to which his loyalty can remain whole-hearted. But it would be wrong to oppose two complementary attitudes. In any case every Christian accepts many disloyalties in his life ; but every Christian also has his objections, and the most loyal of citizens will never confuse the civil law with the law of God.

At this time, when the world is so weighed down with distress, I realise with humiliation that it is inadequate to bring nothing but questions and doubts to such a burning problem. In every sphere, we are all thirsting for truth, clear, irresistible and powerful. But let us beware of making assertions acquired without an uncompromising intellectual honesty ; let us guard against illusions about ourselves or about God. It is perhaps the fatal shock of so many false certainties which may prove our undoing. Man always falls back into the sin of Adam : he cannot submit to receiving all revelation of good and evil *hic et nunc* — through God alone. As Kierkegaard writes : “ All Christian knowledge, however rigid its form, is necessarily a form of restlessness. But this very restlessness is instructive for us.”

What do we mean by Order of Creation

M.C. SLOTEMAKER DE BRUINE

Our concrete life brings us in contact with people in the different relationships of blood, community of work, daily intercourse, etc. That is the reality of life, of which it is said in Revelations that God, the Creator of all life, arranges it thus. Every "chance" encounter and every lasting life-union belongs to this reality. The important thing is, that we live in these circumstances, that we are placed in this environment with our needs, tendencies and leading motives. We can to a certain extent free ourselves from circumstances, we can cultivate certain motives and not others. We can make choices (work, marriage). The order of creation, in which we live and of which we are a part, offers us a tremendous variety of possibilities, and every relationship has a special nature and special aspects for the people concerned. We can decide what to make of it. Recognition of the order of creation entails setting aside individual self-sufficiency and obediently entering the life-community, and through it following the lines of one's personal development.

The existence of these relationships brings us under the commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour!" That is a practical commandment, affecting every concrete situation; it does not express general views, but in all our dealings, projects and enterprises it directs our attention to the presence of other people. This commandment applies to *all* relationships.

The different relations have their own structure: the family with parents and children; marriage, work, nation, culture, Church. What the word "love" signifies and includes in the different cases depends on the particular relationship.

The character of this relationship is brought out with special force in the relationship between man and woman,

where the sexual relation is predominant. This brings with it a special kind of love with its own physical, psychic and social conditions.

Different again is the social-political order, in which the interconnection and community of state and nation creates special relationships, bringing all kinds of men and groups into our "neighbourhood" and making them our "neighbours". All the circumstances of our life and all our actions imply a way of loving or not loving, a way of being indifferent to or interested in our neighbour (e.g. through the regulation of wages, the production of labour, consumption, profession, luxury, electoral rights, social laws, philanthropy, education, culture).

The form of community life, regarded in this way, may be called an order of creation, if this is understood to mean the given reality in which I am placed, with its presuppositions. My environment has a definite structure, a definite essence of its own; in how far these are unalterable or merely temporary is an open question. At any rate, in a period of cultural crisis one can see how intense and how deep are the changes taking place in the structure. The relations of men and women are regarded and described very differently, even within the limits of monogamous marriage, even within Christianity. I mention some particular problems: the husband's authority, the aim of marriage — is the purpose of marriage the begetting of children? — The permission of lust, the use of contraceptives, all these questions affect the heart of the structure.

There are many different attitudes also towards the structure of national life. Every nation has its particular composition of blood and spirit, nature and culture, disposition and history. For instance, are similar norms applicable to the nation as to individuals?

In the Bible the second sphere is seldom emphasised; no special attention is paid to it. Even the change from the polygamous to the monogamous society is passed over in silence. Abraham and Solomon accept polygamy, and the New Testament accepts monogamy, both equally as a matter of course. The words, "For this cause shall a man leave

father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife ", quoted by Jesus from Genesis 2, 24 (Matt. 19, 35) still have a matriarchal sound. One idea survives : that such relationships must not be broken arbitrarily. Man is commanded to be loyal in marriage, as a citizen, and in his work. In the Bible this idea of loyalty always takes the form of obedience to God : " What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder " (Matt. 19, 6). It is a command to obedience and devotion in the situation in which one is placed ; e.g. Ruth's loyalty to her mother-in-law, i.e. to her marriage ; Moses' loyalty to his people ; Jesus pays taxes.

On the other hand, in the Bible such relationships are continually broken for the sake of the Kingdom of God. Abraham is called away from his country and from his own family ; Jesus says, " If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." (Luke 14, 26). Jesus is rejected by His nation and Church as a blasphemer. The disciples are called away from their work for the cause of the Kingdom of God. Jesus says : " Let the dead bury their dead." Jesus rejoices over the great faith of the Canaanite woman, who refuses to be prevented by national and religious barriers from claiming Jesus' help. (Matt. 15, 22).

In the Bible daily life in all its forms is regarded from two aspects : that of creation and that of judgment. Herein lies the significance of Paul's sermon in the Ariopag (Acts 17), where he draws attention to the two points which are given by God and which must be brought out in the Christian message : creation and judgment. Emphasis in both regards is laid on God's sovereignty and good pleasure, and on the commandment, that man must live in obedience to God (Micah 6, 8). " Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God, and thy neighbour ". These two realities of creation and of judgment enter constantly into the concrete situations of life, but always both together. So difference of nationality may be regarded as an " order of creation " (Acts 17, 26) ; but the ultimate meaning of creation is brought out in the words " of one blood " (cf. also Genesis 11, the Tower of Babel). The

structure of national life (which is differently analysed and described in every age and by different minds) is thus led up through creation and judgment to a Beyond, where we break through to a pure relationship of man with God. An example of this is the good Samaritan, and the universality of Paul who says, "in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek". From the point of view of creation and judgment, the relationship between man and woman is raised to a life for one another, a duality in unity, in which the question of separation is simply inconceivable (Matt. 19, 4). Here again the idea of creation introduced another Beyond, which throws the difference of sex into the background. In Genesis 2 we read how God first created a human being, and afterwards man and woman. This finds an echo in what Jesus says about the "children of the resurrection... who do not marry... for they are equal unto the angels." (Luke 20, 36).

As the two poles of the Christian message — creation and judgment — are so radically opposed, it is difficult to regard the structure of concrete life as a direct "order of creation"; these two poles remain in the "Here and Now". There is a double advantage in distinguishing sharply between the Here and the Beyond.

The more unconditional the structures, the more they obstruct the way which the commandment of love — with its eternal character — is seeking. The more forcefully the "laws of life" are allowed to speak, the more God's commandments are restricted, and one is in danger of shackling His power (Mark 7, 13). To Brunner's words, "God's commandment is not a law which works on a higher plane than the given reality, and has no connection with it; it is God's command which has created this reality" (*Das Gebot und die Ordnungen*, page 192), one may ask, whether God's commandment does not really come to us as a strange commandment, which is "based" only on God's good pleasure. One does not obey because one sees that it is appropriate to love God and one's neighbour. Anyone who rejects this commandment is a fool, in the biblical sense that he does not know God. We must not make too ample use of the conception of creation, for if we use it to describe

the structures of life, it cannot be applied when we (precisely through our structural limitation) run into a "cul de sac" — be it as man or woman, or as a nation in the midst of other nations. Then we look round perplexed for a word which comes to us from Beyond the structural complexities. That is the tragedy of modern man, that he no longer understands the words "Thou shalt love" as a voice from God, shaking the earth in thunder, (Heb. 12, 21-26), but tries to interpret it as a voice of his own.

On the other hand, the realisation that the structures of the actual world belong to our Here and Now helps us in our investigation and description of these structures. Otherwise the true sense of immanence would be lacking. The values which must be protected need not be called "eternal". The changing elements of national life, the economic factors, the geographic conditions, the racial problems, the cultural relations, the religious conditions — this varicoloured complexity of facts and ideas, of which life is composed, can be taken fully into account. No nation will esteem itself indispensable on account of its significant character. But human life contains the full seriousness of concrete reality which changes with time and in which we have to show our obedience. In the relationships of men and women for instance new factors will be perceived, e.g. the new status of woman, the changing conception of love and marriage.

We are living between two "Beyonds": the origin of creation in which God assures us that He has made us as we are; that He has called us into life that we may love Him and our neighbour; on the other hand the judgment in which our life in all its concreteness is kept as in a melting-pot ("saved as by fire", I. Cor. 3, 15), i.e. submitted to the Gospel. These two points delimit our Here and Now, i.e. our everyday civic life, our marriage, our work, etc., as expressed in its different forms all over the world of 1933.

From the twofold aspect of creation and judgment, the call comes to everyone to take responsible part in the order of present-day life, to look as deeply as possible into the structure and chaos, and in one's own life to act obediently and decisively from moment to moment.

Christianity and Nationalism

EMANUEL RADL

The teachings of Jesus are deeper than any political programme for the organisation of this world, be it democracy, nationalism or communism; there is also no theology, orthodox or unorthodox, which can reach the full depths of Jesus' words. One should, therefore, be cautious and tolerant towards different theological explanations of the New Testament and towards the method which likes to oppose one word of Jesus against another, e.g. which accepts the theological parts of the Gospel and puts the Sermon on the Mount aside as meant for certain types of men only. Naturally, also the ideas of this article come under this category and should be read as an inadequate attempt to solve a most difficult problem.

Jesus was not a revolutionary in the political sense of the word. He was not a nationalist, nor an internationalist, because these are modern problems and because Jesus had more important things to do than to prepare a mere political revolution. This being accepted almost universally, the problem arises; what relation is there between the Kingdom of Heaven and the kingdom of this world? Here lies, it seems to me, the root of the problem of nationalism in its relation to Christianity. Are these two kingdoms (if they are two) mechanically separated, so that one can live in only one kingdom at once? The more one ponders the consequences of the mechanical separation of the realm of God and the realm of politics, the less acceptable it seems to be. We cannot approach God except through human means, through some kind of works; prayer for instance is a prayer for something, for the health of our children, for daily bread, is therefore a way to advance some wish and is an effort to influence the history of this world. He who prays for victory in a war, himself takes part in the war, and is to that extent

personally and directly responsible towards God for that war. Our intentions are never purely spiritual; only theological abstractions are purely spiritual. There is, however, no chasm between the private and public good for which we pray; if we pray for the health of our child we send for the physician; if we pray for our government we try also to help it by our political acts. To pray and not to help is blasphemy. Our interest in political matters, of which nationalism is a part, is therefore a mere manifestation of our daily life which lies under God's law; our relations to the government and to the laws of our country have the same value before God as our relations to our father or to our neighbour. There is no insurmountable opposition between charity and — political — law, there is no metaphysical antagonism between them. Love is not a haphazard concept; it can be systematised, organised, put into law, and remains still true love. The education of a child can certainly be a real act of love on the part of the teacher; does it cease being real love, when the education is methodical and embraces many children at once? It is still love when he tries to constrain the pupil to behave in an orderly manner. There is no love divorced from a will to induce the beloved to do or not to do something. Even those who oppose law and charity, either as anarchists or as adherents of the dualism of two swords — one spiritual and one political — accept nevertheless the fact that God punishes people very severely. If they do not approve of His punishment, how can they believe that God is the ruler of this world? If they accept, they approve; to approve means to support; if they approve, are they not personally responsible? And through whom, if not through men like ourselves, does God punish? But it is God Who gives the laws, democratic laws as well as other forms.

Our country is a large group of neighbours, properly organised as a state; the laws of our country are — or at least should be — the best ways to deal systematically with our brethren. Nationalism, therefore, cannot avoid being judged from the moral and religious standpoint.

Some people object to the condition that political law, the task of which is to command and which is necessarily

backed by force, should be compatible with charity, which should not recognise force. This condition leads, however, to pessimism about the affairs of this world, a pessimism which can hardly be supported by Jesus' words. It is true that the mere formula of a law has no right to be called Christian ; it is also true that the mere mechanical fulfilment of laws does not mean anything for the Christian life. But then, no mechanical activity has the right to be called Christian. The problem is not mechanical fulfilment, but whether or not charity has need of laws, as in my opinion it has, the laws for the protection of children or the laws governing the relations between men and women can be looked upon as a negation of charity only by insincere people.

This most important problem of the relation of Christians to state laws is not always solved in the way we have tried to sketch above. Many Christians try to separate the Kingdom of God from the kingdom of this world mechanically, so that they as citizens of the realm of God, would like to repudiate any responsibility for this world, the Kingdom of God being metaphysical and completely separated from daily life. Asceticism and its modern analogies, cosmopolitanism and anarchism, are the practical results of such repudiation. Cosmopolitanism and anarchism look upon patriotism and nationalism as upon something low, not fitted for the high aspirations of a spiritual man ; the cosmopolitan is, therefore, inclined to repudiate responsibility for the political life of his own country. The anarchist protests only a little more radically against every law as violence and an attack against his absolute freedom. This sort of cosmopolitanism and anarchism is widespread among some radical pacifists just at present.

In order to avoid asceticism, another group of Christians divide the individual man into two separate beings, one theological, one political ; the theological self lives with God in the Church, the political self settles the laws of the country ; the theological self is private, lives in charity, loves his neighbour, trusts in mercy as the only rule in the Kingdom of God ; the political self of the same man, however, wages war against his neighbour, passes sentences of capital punishment, and is

unmerciful toward offenders. How these two selves can live in one heart is a problem not to be solved here.

Cosmopolitanism and anarchism are impracticable because we are forced to live in this world and take responsibility for it : political life is either good or bad ; and we are obliged to help what is good in it and to fight against what is bad. Neither the cosmopolitan nor the anarchist, therefore, can be fully consistent. The dualism of a life under the government of pure love separated from life under the laws of this world — the theory of “two swords”, as it is called — simply is not logical.

Our relation to God is direct. Neither Church, nor government, nor king can remove from anyone the responsibility for everything we do or avoid doing.

“For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me ; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me”. These words are clear : if God has created the family, He has created the individual before and above the family ; and if He has created the state, He has not liberated the citizen from responsibility for it. Some people try to interpose between God and our daily life a series of lower gods ; a god of the family, a god of the Church, a god of the state, a god of commerce. The nation-god becomes thus an autonomous being, to whom we are directly responsible, and only through its mediation are we governed by God the Almighty. Such a hierarchy of gods cannot be acceptable to a Christian. No nation-god can relieve us of our personal responsibility for the decision to leave our family, if necessary, for Jesus' sake — or even our nation. No monarch can take from us this responsibility for everything which our state does.

If it is true that we are directly responsible to God for the condition of the world, we are responsible also for our nationalism, whatever our nation. The term “nationalism” is used in many meanings ; sometimes it is a superstition that

our country is an absolute being and that we must follow its laws and decisions right or wrong. Another time "nationalism" means the idea that all people of the same clan — presumably the offspring of one common father — should be united under one government; or again nationalism means to oppress the members of another nationality, of another race, another language-group, another creed, included in one state.

Nationalism in one or another of these meanings is today the ruling political idea in many countries. It is surely no very high ideal; and there have been much higher ideals in the past. We need not, however, accept even so democratic a movement (democratic in the sense that it has caught large masses of people in many countries). We should be tolerant, sympathetic towards it, as far as possible. We should co-operate, if necessary, for there are many sincere people who look upon nationalism as upon something holy. There are two main reservations we must make, however. In nationalism itself there is hardly anything Christian. Language, local history, the race, mean nothing before God, before Whom we are all equal, sinful men. Nationalism should be looked upon as a local affair, just as are the special loyalties in some cities, some districts — the loyalty towards a costume, towards local festivals, dialects. It is very human to be interested in local loyalties; all of us have full right to cultivate them. Internationalism is misunderstood when it ridicules loyalty towards one's own language or manners. Internationalism is often vague, and some people mean cosmopolitanism when they speak about internationalism. If, however, we understand internationalism as the duty to respect in the first place the human qualities in our neighbour, to consider him a brother in Christ, a man with whom we have common responsibilities before God, and if we see in his language, his race, his local laws, education, political allegiance only different kinds of manifestations of humanity, then this internationalism is nearer to God than nationalism.

Though there are nationalists, who realise that nationalism also should be laid at the throne of God as one of the means to serve our neighbour, in general nationalism has the

tendency to narrow-mindedness, to antagonisms against other peoples or other states, other races, other creeds and to over-stressing purely accidental, secular things. Is it not strange that it is nationalism which so often retaliates and tries to restrict the application of the Sermon on the Mount? In this respect nationalism is one of the foremost instances of the so-called secularism of our times, and as such must be named along with communism. Notwithstanding its prominence, it is impractical to fight nationalism by mere negation, or by a vague cosmopolitanism, or anarchism. Loyalty to the laws of one's country should be the duty of every citizen; loyalty to local political interests is perfectly human and should be accepted with sympathy. These loyalties have, however, just at present so over-ridden the moral duties of man towards man, the conviction that our Christian allegiance to Jesus must be proved by our private and public dealings in this world, that, I am afraid, nationalism in its virulent forms must be looked upon as one of the great sins of our time.

An Orthodox Approach to Nationalism

A.I. NIKITIN

It seems to us that it is impossible to speak about a definite and specific Orthodox conception of the nation, theologically elaborated and officially stated. Orthodox theologians have not devoted themselves to developing the theoretical teaching about the nation. But the whole Orthodox outlook on the world certainly implies answers to all the most fundamental questions, as a result of the fact that humanity consists of different nations and that the human personality is gifted with a special faculty for experiencing this.

We shall, therefore, try to approach the subject from the standpoint of the most fundamental beliefs of Orthodox Christian teaching. From this we hope to come to the solution of the practical problems which are troubling the mind of the present generation. Thus we shall write as a non-theologian Orthodox might treat the subject. In no way can we pretend that this will be an official Orthodox point of view, adopted and confirmed by theological authorities.

The fundamental truths of the Orthodox Christian faith are : the incarnation of God in the personality of our Lord Jesus Christ, His death and Resurrection in the body, the Church of Christ on earth, in which the Holy Spirit has been acting through the centuries, and the idea of the Kingdom of God in the perspective of eternal life. To this must be added the strong Orthodox conviction of the reality of evil as a mystical power, which pervades the whole world. "The whole world lies in wickedness", this is for an Orthodox a fundamental fact which never permits him to be reconciled with the existing state of the world. This state cannot be regarded as a final one. In the Kingdom of God the glorification of the whole cosmos, of all creation must take place.

Such a conviction removes us very far from any kind of naturalism and especially from any theory of cultural progress, inevitably leading to the final happiness of humanity. The idea of the Kingdom of God includes not only the destiny of mankind, but that of all creation, which cannot be left aside in the present disharmony. We believe literally in "a new heaven and a new earth". The leading path to this belief is the Incarnation, through which every earthly thing was sanctified, and the Resurrection of Jesus Christ in body, which is the proof of our own resurrection and final victory over sin, as even death, "the last enemy", has been overcome by Jesus Christ. This belief leads us to the jubilant joy of liturgical life, with the Eucharist at its centre, and to the glorification of the Great Easter, which is a symbol of the glorification and transfiguration of the whole world, when God will be all in all. As Professor Arseniew states in his book on the mysticism of the Eastern Church, "the Christian message about the Cross and Resurrection proclaims the suppression of the cosmic laws; it contains a seed of infinite potentiality, the seed of a complete revolution in the apprehension of the world and of life".

It is necessary to emphasise that such an understanding of the fundamental truths in the Christian faith is not representative only of theological thinking, which sometimes may be very far from the psychology of the average believer. In fact, the eschatological expectation is very familiar to the mind of every Orthodox believer, whose religious life is based on the deep and organic contact with the life of the Church. It was familiar to people of all classes in Russia, peasants as well as representatives of the highest intelligentsia. My personal experience in Bulgaria proves the same to be true there. Short contacts through the Federation with Roumanian, Greek and Serbian youth give the impression that this is true of those peoples also. So we are dealing not with purely theological statements, but with the general belief of the Orthodox people and, therefore, in all our deliberations we are standing not on theoretical but on practical ground. Let us pass on now from these fundamental elements of the Orthodox religious mind to our real subject.

The Christian faith was revealed by Jesus Christ in His teaching as well as in life in such all-embracing categories, so to speak, that it completely overcomes any previously existing divisions among the people, and particularly national divisions. Is there any room for national limits in the realm of such truths as the Incarnation which, as we stated before, signifies the deification of all that had been created by God, even dead substance ? Likewise the truth of the glorification and transfiguration of the whole world, in which every human being will find its destiny, makes us feel that national divisions have no ontological relation to those processes which lie on a certain infinitely higher plane. How understandable and natural for us, therefore, is the revelation of God, as the Father of all men, given through Jesus Christ. And unity in Christ, the experience of Christian love, as it had been revealed through the Lord Himself, His apostles, and the primitive Christian communities, can it be hampered or minimised by national divisions in spite of all the painful experiences of history ? Certainly not. Every Christian whose heart is really open to Jesus Christ has to direct all his thoughts and aspirations to these great revelations, and base his outlook upon the world on the fundamental truths of Christian faith.

Thus we come to the first important conclusion : national divisions, nation, and all that is implied in this historical phenomenon, cannot have a supreme value for us. Nationalism as a complex of feelings and convictions must never play a leading rôle and command our minds and actions. The fact of existing national divisions is a result of sin (" The whole world lies in wickedness "). These divisions have to be overcome by the way of Christian love and, therefore, the fact itself, as well as all that derives from it, can have no absolute significance.

A man whose attitude to his nation and country is not controlled and modified by the fundamental truths and purposes of his Christian faith, is a destructive power in this world. We cannot associate ourselves with any national movement, in which religion and Church have a secondary value and are taken only as another item in the programme.

Because in such a case there exists always the danger of a false perspective, and people can unconsciously be involved in such compromises as national, political or class hatred, so that the highest purposes of our Christian ideal may be replaced by others, very relative ones, for which it is not worth while to sacrifice our life.

This leads us to conclude that there exists a certain great task, given to us by God in the world as we find it in different historical epochs, and that this task must have been known to the Orthodox consciousness. This task must appeal to individuals as well as to every nation. Can it not be traced in the Russian people as a predominantly Orthodox nation ?

Answering this question, let us speak on behalf of some outstanding representatives of Russian national genius, who certainly expressed deep aspirations of the nation as a whole. The first place here undoubtedly belongs to Dostoievsky. The religious philosopher Vladimir Solovieff characterises the central idea, which possessed the mind of Dostoievsky, as follows : " This was a Christian idea of the free unity of all mankind, of world-wide brotherhood in the name of Christ. Dostoievsky had in mind just this idea when he spoke about the true Church, about œcumenic Orthodoxy. In this idea he had seen the spiritual substance of the Russian people, though not yet revealed, as well as its historical task. The true Church, which Dostoievsky proclaimed, is œcumenic primarily in the sense that in it the divisions of humanity into different nations and races — which are in a state of mutual competition and antagonism — disappear for ever. In speaking about the special mission of Russia, Dostoievsky never had in mind its national exclusivity. On the contrary, he saw the whole vocation of the Russian people in the service of true Christianity, in which there is neither Greek nor Jew. Dostoievsky never made the nation an ideal, nor worshipped it as an idol. He believed in Russia and predicted a great future for it just because of a very limited national egoism and exclusivity in the Russian character."

Dostoievsky himself expressed this ardent conviction in his famous address about Pouchkin, which was delivered in 1880 and had a tremendous influence on the minds of the

Russian intelligentsia. From the analysis of Pouchkin's genius he comes to the conclusion : " To be really Russian, entirely Russian, means to be brother to all people, ' pan-human ', if you like. For a true Russian Europe and its destiny, as well as the destiny of the whole Aryan race, must be as precious as Russia itself, as the destiny of our native mother-land, because our destination is œcumenism, realised not by a sword but by the power of brotherhood and by our brotherly longing for the re-union of all people ".

The dream of Dostoievsky about the reconciliation of all nations is really remarkable. Professor Zenkovsky has reason to say in one of his books, that in spite of all the literature about Dostoievsky and the world-wide influence of his ideas, the spiritual heritage left by him is as yet almost unknown. One of his sayings fully states the Orthodox point of view with regard to the relativity of the national principle : " We Russians too have mother-countries : our Russia and Europe ", which means that as soon as we enter the spiritual treasury of European culture, national barriers cease to exist.

In the following quotation we can see also the supreme value of spiritual things, in comparison with natural instinct, such as national feelings : " A Russian sympathises with all that is human without any distinction of race, nation or country He possesses the instinct of pan-humanity. ... It is terrible to feel to what extent a Russian is free in spirit : nobody is able as he is to break from his native soil ".

Vladimir Solovieff considers as a characteristic feature of the Russian Orthodox people their longing for holiness. He did not mean that the Russian nation succeeded or will succeed in reaching a high degree of holiness. Dostoievsky, Gogol and our other thinkers often called the Russian nation the most sinful among the European nations. Solovieff simply meant that the ideal of holiness is known to the Russian heart as an ideal of supreme value. " Holy Russia requires a holy task ". This leads him to say that " all that is good in Russian history was based on the rejection of national egoism ".

In an article of this length we cannot quote many other Russian thinkers, most of whom very strongly expressed the idea that the Orthodox mind never could be satisfied with narrow and practical national conceptions.

It is worth while to mention just here that, if there was in the past and exists at present in Russian writers a very definite criticism with regard to other European nations, its basis never was national ambition and exclusiveness. The life and culture of the other European nations was always valued from the point of view of a possible realisation of the Christian ideal. The conclusions were very often gloomy and disappointing. Hence arose a conviction that Russia must not follow the way of Western culture. Here are, for example, some prophetic words of Gogol, uttered after his long visit to Europe in the middle of last century : " Wait a little, soon there will arise such lamentations and groans from below that the heads of the most distinguished statesmen will become giddy. And this will happen just in the countries which look so well organised from the outside and whose brilliant life enraptures and attracts us. In Europe at present such complications are arising that no human measures will be able to help ... How to put everything in its proper place (to return to real religious ground) ? It cannot be done in Europe itself : she will be thrown down into bloodshed, will be weakened and will not succeed in escaping catastrophes ". He says this with unspeakable sorrow, almost despair.

In everything that we have said above, our aim has been to show that the dream about the unity of the whole world is very near to the Orthodox mind. We shall pass now to some very difficult practical problems related to this principal position of Orthodox consciousness with regard to the nation, and the supreme ways of God. We value most highly all the attempts made to establish mutual understanding and contact between Christians of different nations. The work of the World's Student Christian Federation affords a unique practical possibility for cooperation along this line. But we must be aware of very complicated problems which confront us at every point of our thinking. Their cause lies in

the fact that we, while keeping the highest Christian ideals, at the same time cannot dissociate ourselves from the reality of this empiric world. The purpose of God is that we should cooperate with Him for the transfiguration of this world, being an organic part of it. We cannot transfer ourselves onto the spiritual plane of existence, and so far we are subject to all controversies inherent in this world. Knowing very well the relative value of a nation, we cannot exist outside a nation, and outside of a state. Therefore, pure cosmopolitanism cannot be accepted. The following opinion of Belinsky seems to be in full accord with the Orthodox outlook on the world : " Every nation has its part to play in the great family of mankind, its particular part given it by Providence ; it makes its special contribution to the world's treasury ; every nation expresses certain sides of life, of the whole of humanity. Cosmopolitanism is a false, strange, ambiguous and inconceivable phenomenon. A man for whom *ubi bene ibi patria* is an abnormal being not worthy of the holy name *homo* ".

We fully realise to what tragic practical situations the acceptance of such a standpoint brings us. First of all, it does not allow us to accept a negative attitude concerning war. So far humanity can exist only through the state. The problem of state, although it cannot always be identified with the problem of nation, is in most practical cases connected with it. Through state, although non-Christian in its essence, the forces of evil are limited from the outside, are suppressed to a certain extent by the power of state. The state-order is outside of the domain of God's grace. It represents a certain transitory stage in the process of realisation of God's plan for the world. It is not altogether good or bad. It cannot fully satisfy our Christian aspirations, but we cannot condemn it entirely, and dissociate ourselves from it. Therefore, we cannot approve the false socialism of certain of our western pacifist friends who refuse in principle to fight for the state under any circumstances. Although state and nation are acknowledged to be relative values from our Christian standpoint, still there may be situations in which our duty is to fight for the state or with the state.

Certainly sin is inevitably involved in any war. But in some cases, non-participation in a given war can be a still greater sin. The problem always presents itself as a paradox : we have to choose between two evils. And it happens, that sometimes to take part in the war will mean to choose a lesser evil. This point of view is approved by the Orthodox mind through the fact that one of the most venerated Saints of the Orthodox Church, Saint Sergius of Radonej, had blessed and encouraged Prince Dmitry of the Don, to undertake a great battle against the Tartars with the aim of overthrowing their dominion in Russia. There are also a number of Saints who, during their lives, were noble warriors.

It does not mean that there can exist a definite cult of war. As long as war is not on, we must fight for peace and condemn war by all possible means. From this point of view we accept whole-heartedly the resolution which was approved by the General Committee of the W.S.C.F. in Peking in 1922. But we must not forget that evil forces are always in operation, and in spite of all our efforts war can be introduced by them. And then we find ourselves in the position of inevitable choice which is quite free and open for the Orthodox mind.

At the same time we do not attribute to the state or to the nation the right of requiring unreserved obedience from its members. No general formula can be suggested here for right conduct. Every individual case must be treated separately and Christian consciousness is always free to say : " We ought to obey God rather than men ". And we must courageously meet all the possible consequences of such a declaration, even if it involves death.

Vladimir Solovieff writes against the so-called " zoological nationalism " : " The worship of class, nation and other idols inevitably leads to immoral and bloodthirsty events ". Here naturally the question must be asked, according to which criterion can we decide upon our conduct in every individual case ? For every Orthodox Christian this criterion is his Christian conscience and Christian mind, not individualistic but enlightened by the wisdom of the Orthodox Church's teaching, practice and tradition. We certainly admit the

possibility of errors and fatal mistakes. In such a case the only consolation is penitence, humility before God and hope for His merciful grace.

Does the Orthodox mind believe in the gradual progress and reconciliation of races and nations, and the establishing of the Kingdom of God at a certain historical moment of our earthly existence? This question implies also the question of the possibility of a peaceful solution of all the burning problems, which weigh so intolerably upon us today. We think there would be a divergency of opinions here among the Orthodox. We shall answer this question by some quotations from one of the recent books of Professor N.A. Berdiaeff :

“The Gospel cannot be understood as a norm or as a law ... The Gospel reveals the absolute life of the Kingdom of God, and everything in it differs radically from the relative life of the world ... This is the revelation of the absolute, divine life which does not resemble the sinful life of the world ... The Gospel commandments are entirely unfeasible and impossible as rules. But what is impossible to man, is possible to God ... There exists a complete difference, contrast and incompatibility between the Gospel and the world. The Christian state, Christian economics, Christian family, Christian science, Christian traditions never existed and never will exist, for in the Kingdom of God and in the perfect divine life there exists neither state nor economics, nor family, nor science, nor traditions, subject to the law ... But the Gospel revelation about the Kingdom of God in a secret unseen way introduced a blessed change into all spheres of life, changed the very structure of the human soul, created new emotions. The Kingdom of God comes imperceptibly. The Gospel does not teach so much the practical solution of the problems of life, but rather leads to the regeneration of the soul itself”.

“While ye have light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light”. (John 12, 36.)

Nationalism as Seen by an Indian Christian

H.C. BALASUNDARUM

It is difficult to discuss this subject without encountering at the outset the formidable argument — how can nationalism be ever reconciled to the principles of peace and goodwill which are the fundamental elements of the Christian Faith? For has not Christianity proved itself to be ineffective in the presence of the passions engendered by nationalism?

Sir Philip Gibbs describes the situation in the European countries twelve years after the Great War and says, "new frontiers were made between nations and the minds of nations. Their armies stood on guard, suspicious, ready for new wars, hostile, with inflamed patriotism or with a sense of fear". Even now we are living in an atmosphere of suppressed hostility and open derision. The few who attempt to usher in a new world-order are ridiculed out of existence, as being impracticable idealists or well-intentioned cranks.

Certain elements emerge out of a consideration of the situation. Leadership born of a robust faith in God and mankind, there is none. What passes for leadership is the clever manipulation of details by one who happens to be in power. Because of the unworthy adventures of the few who are devoid of principles there is a growing distrust of all efforts. Statesmanship has receded into the background, giving place to administrative expedients — all combining to produce an attitude of despair. That is where we are now. In India at the present juncture one does not know how to adjudicate aright in matters of high importance. The nerve to do the right has, alas, become a thing of the past.

Christian experience bids us face the challenge. In the name of Jesus Christ there is something which could be offered to a distracted world, though it is an extraordinarily

difficult task to turn the attention of a critical world away from the scene of wreckage.

The first element in the offer of Jesus Christ is the fact, that the whole of life is a great gift from the hands of God. If we could get people to see that life is not the result of man's power of adjustment and manufacture, but simply the outcome of the generosity of a good and gracious God, then we would have accomplished perhaps the most important part of our task. Recognition of this fact will mean two distinct things — that we learn to look to God for the completion of the picture of our country's greatness, seeking at the same time His assistance in the eradication of all those features which mar the beauty of God's creation.

What destroys the grace of nationalism is the ugly determination on the part of one nation, to subordinate and sacrifice the interests and well-being of another nation. Behind this desire is the absence of any sense of the sanctity of personality. That several nations should continue to exist alongside of one another and that each should make its own distinctive contribution, are not the cardinal principles of nations which seek to dominate the smaller and weaker peoples of the world. To Mazzini humanity was an orchestra in which each nation has its own appropriate instrument to play, its own distinctive contribution to the harmony of the whole. To Aggrey of Africa the peoples of the world were like the white and black keys of the piano. [This interdependence and happy commingling of the races is an idea, to which unfortunately to this day respect is paid more in the breach than in the observance. In the approach of Jesus Christ extraordinary emphasis is placed upon the value of human personality — the freshness and effectiveness of this "good news" being the basis of the now widely understood and accepted attitude towards the aspirations of the less fortunately-circumstanced peoples of the globe, as for instance, the depressed classes of India.

This respect for personality, so beautifully illustrated in the life of Jesus Christ, involves what is almost impossible for ordinary mortals to understand. It is the Son of Man's peculiar sensitiveness to that subtle capacity in man which

appreciates the things that are lovely and of good report. Some are in a position to give expression to that inner desire, while there are others who have not in them to vaunt it in the public places. To find that submerged pearl and to adore its beauty was given to Jesus Christ. How very difficult it is for men to act likewise is described by Dr. Edwyn Bevan in his book *Indian Nationalism* — “and that sort of imagination has not been the Englishman’s strong point. The pain of starvation, this he understands and would labour to spare you, but the pain that comes from some sensibility wounded, from some ideal violated, that he finds it hard to understand. I don’t think it true to say that he is merely material; he has his own ideals, the ideal, for instance, of professional duty — not an unworthy one; but he finds it hard to believe that other people’s sensibilities are real”.

Again and again one comes across the failure of the representative of one nation to understand the aspirations of the man from another nation. There are rare exceptions, as for instance, in the most thrilling example of Lord Irwin as Viceroy of India, winning over a whole people by the force of his own personality as well as by the gift of understanding, which he possesses in such abundant measure. Mr. J. Coatman in the book *The Years of Destiny* sets out to describe the work of Lord Irwin and maintains, that the late Viceroy was able to accomplish the well-nigh impossible because of his unbounded faith amidst baffling circumstances. The preeminent factor in the establishment of the Kingdom of God is the faith, which Jesus Christ had, in that most cosmopolitan crowd — His disciples. What a crowd to deal with, with all their preconceived notions, with all their mistaken ideas and with all their ambitions. Yet that group astounded the world in later years by their fortitude and ambitions for a redeemed world.

What, one may ask, is the task of Christian nationalism at this juncture? It is the duty and pride of the Christian to intervene at this moment and not “to wait and see”. That intervention will mean that into a mess without God, the power to create order and the consciousness of the nearness of the Supernatural has been introduced. For,

where there is an abiding sense of God, there will be no room for disorder. And order will be followed by the sense of security. All traces of distrust will vanish. We will learn to see that our safety lies not in the subordination, but in the elevation of the neighbour.

“Automatic internationalism is not enough. It must be vitalised”, says Professor Alfred Zimmern. Christianity has done one great thing for the world. It has made dead bones live. Freshness is its great gift. People have got accustomed to certain things in life. We have all got into a rut. Even the League of Nations, except in one or two directions, has ceased to restrain nations from warring tendencies. It is only Jesus Christ who can introduce into this dull uniformity something of the aroma of the Kingdom of God. Did He not say, “except ye become like little children, ye cannot enter the Kingdom of God”. He was referring, amongst other things, to the eagerness with which the little child turns to this side and that, when it is attracted to the colour of the flower or the brightness of the sun.

Yet another task to which Christian nationalism has to address itself. The redemption of man was not accomplished in the palaces of kings. It was won on the Cross of Calvary. “Even unto death” — that is the way of the Master. There was no other way, and to this day another alternative has not been found. The cleansing of the nation and the establishing of the individual can be done only to the extent the disciples of the present-day are ready to accept the way of the Cross. Is the Christian Church ready for the adventure? Is the ambassador of Christ in the front line or in the rear? Jesus Christ offers Himself even now as the companion of all those who have to bear the burden of the day and endure the terror of the night. God in very truth suffers with us.

“Give me, for light, the sunshine of Thy sorrow,
Give me, for shelter, shadow of Thy Cross;
Give me to share the glory of Thy morrow,
Gone from my heart the bitterness of Loss”.

(G.A. Studdert Kennedy.)

If suffering, with a view to a thorough cleansing, is the only way according to the charter of Christian nationalism and if God our Father treads the path with us, then we have reason to be jubilant regarding the future. As we walk through the valley we are buoyed with hope that the end, which happily is hidden from our view, is bound to be clothed in splendour. To attain the summit many a steep ascent has to be made. But the achievement is even now our proud possession. This joyous confidence is needed because of the obsession of the present which is disastrous to all progressive development. "Christianity", as Dr. P.T. Kirk mentions in his *Bampton Lectures* for 1928, "had come into the world with a double purpose, to offer men the vision of God, and to call them to the pursuit of that vision".

We have visions of the future. But they are visions which are tainted with our sordid imaginations. And it is desperately difficult to rise superior to the surroundings. A nationalism which stirs our imagination out of its environment into something great and grand is well worth striving for. How very futile are the endeavours of man is indicated by Canon Raven who says, "the noblest apologist is in fact not the thinker but the saint; men are infected with Christianity rather than argued into it". This infectious approach is the proud and precious contribution of Jesus Christ.

The first and last function then of Christian nationalism is to bring individuals, groups and nations to the consciousness that in Christ there is One Who, understanding as He does the agonies of the human heart, has also the will and the power to offer a new life — the life with God.

The Christian and War

André PHILIP

Before entering on the problem "Christianity and War", some preliminary remarks must be made. *Christianity makes no distinction between faith and works*; on the other hand, it emphasises the necessity for action, without which there can be no sincere religious life. In this sense Christianity is an ethical doctrine, if by that ethic one means an ideal, a guiding principle manifesting itself differently in every concrete case. On the other hand, Christianity attacks formalism and legalism, because they attach no value to anything but *action*; whereas Jesus regards *the action, and the motive behind it, as indissolubly united*. Action is the necessary, inevitable consequence of a genuine religious life; *but above all, this action must be the natural fruits of the Spirit and of its manifestation in the world*. The value of the act lies in the motive which it reveals. So Christianity is not so much a moral code as an inspiration; it brings a new life, a re-birth of the soul, which means the automatic disappearance of individual actions and social conditions incompatible with it. On the other hand, the spiritual life should normally express itself in action; but these actions must be effective, we must be certain that they adequately express, even in their remotest consequences, the conviction which stands behind them.

Arising out of our inner Christian life, we feel the urge to act both as individuals and in the social sphere. We examine the practical questions and try to find the actions which will be most effective and most consistent with our aims of love and justice.

Shall we find these actions? In the social and international spheres, is there any action which would be a completely adequate expression of the motive behind it? Does not the experience of real life lead us rather to recognise that the

practical action, as realisable in the social sphere, usually entails *a compromise, a degradation, in comparison with the original motive* ? By this I do not mean to assert an opposition between two natures, an absolute heterogeneity between the world and God. But without going into great theological problems, as an economist and politician I am obliged to say that all our actions are insufficient, inadequate, incapable of really expressing the motive by which we are prompted. The world, our social environment, act as a hindrance, an obstacle, a system obedient to laws and subject to determining influences to which we *have* to yield if our actions are to be efficacious ; whereas in our heart of hearts we *cannot* accept either these *determining factors* or the compromises to which they constrain us.

Let us take an example : War. War, in all forms, by reason of the massacre it entails and the hatred it arouses, is obviously anti-Christian. Nevertheless at certain periods it seemed like a sad necessity. The struggle of Rome against the invasions of the Huns which, had it been successful, would have saved us from three centuries of experiment and misery ; the defence of Revolutionary France against the allies who wanted to restore the old régime ; the American War of Independence ; the nationalist revolts in the middle of the nineteenth century ; the revolts of the colonies today ; the wars for national defence — all these have been historically necessary in order to preserve or to obtain certain essential liberties or values. Then the Christian was faced by the choice between two attitudes :

Objection to war on conscientious grounds, thereby rendering an admirable witness to the Christian spirit of love ; but at the same time allowing the defeat of his own people and the disappearance of civilising factors which, although human, are none the less willed by God ;

Acquiescence in the assassination of his brothers in order to preserve these values, the driving of fresh nails into the crucified body of our Saviour. Both attitudes entail *compromise* ; both attitudes reveal the inadequacy of the action in comparison with the spirit of love which ought to

be our guide. Thus we arrive at the point where the problem may be expressed in all its tragic contradiction.

Faith reveals itself naturally through works. The Holy Spirit should inspire and guide our whole life — individual, family and social. Social action is both a definite duty, and the inevitable outcome of a genuine religious life.

This social action may take two different courses : the prophetic or the critical, the revolutionary or the reformist, through speech or through action. But there is no question of a double moral code ; neither of these attitudes is spiritually superior to the other ; according to the individual, the generation, the historical period, either of them may represent a call from God.

Neither of these attitudes achieves a really adequate expression of the motive behind it, and *in both cases* the greatest spiritual danger is that of imagining that it is adequate — affirming that our activity constitutes a Christianisation of the social order.

The dangers of the absolutist attitude, both in the social and in the international sphere, are *pride* and *passivity* : the pride of the pure revolutionary, of the conscientious objector who, owing to the persecution and suffering which he endures, comes to regard himself as the only true follower of Jesus Christ, and to identify the call, which he himself has received, with God's Will for the whole world. He runs the risk of imagining himself immune from sin, and of thanking God that he is not like other man, who accept abominable compromises in order to carry their ideas into immediate and effective action. There is another danger : that of passivity which, together with some extreme forms of Lutheranism, becomes introspective and reduces Christianity to an inner life detached from a corrupt world — a faith which, producing no more fruits, becomes more and more weak and impoverished. It is easy and tempting to condemn the whole world *en masse* so as to avoid fighting it in detail, and too often attitudes which appear absolutist only conceal a shameful conservatism and a reluctance to struggle.

A still greater danger lies in the realist attitude, for here in the midst of the daily struggle for petty advances, submerg-

ed by human passions, continually forced to compromise, it is terribly difficult for the Christian to remain sufficiently self-controlled to preserve his inner freedom in the midst of the combat. The man who wants to reform slavery too often accepts it; the man who defends his country ends by acquiescing in war and hating his adversary; the man who wants power, in order to transform society, ends by wanting to retain his power while forgetting the needed transformation. Action has such a strong influence on our inner natures, that the purity of the original intention constantly runs the risk of having to compromise in practice.

It is here, in my opinion, that the Church ought to intervene, and by the Church I not only mean the invisible Church, the communion of all believers of all countries, all confessions and all times, but also our Mother Church, the *body* of Christ, which is divided today, alas, into fragments scattered all over the world, the visible Church, the concrete community of believers which endeavours to be the centre of inspiration for individual Christian lives. One of the Church's functions should be precisely that of helping the Christian to accomplish what he cannot carry out alone, that of keeping him from evil by showing him the snares strewn along the road, and the danger of compromise. The Church should clarify his spiritual vision, so that in moments of discouragement he can take up the struggle without spiritually *accepting* the compromises to which he is forced to submit.

I do not think that the rôle of the Church is that of intervening directly in social and international affairs; it is rather that of calling souls to repentance and to a new life, of showing them the religious necessity for social action and for technical study. The rôle of the Church is that of preserving the moral principles which ought to inspire the individual, of condemning attitudes and social systems (nationalism, capitalism), which contradict these principles, and thus to a certain extent to guide our individual actions; but it is also, and above all, to show the insufficient, incomplete nature of *all* action; to preserve this distinction between what we wish and what we do, between the motive and the action, without which there can be no genuine religious life,

and no creative social achievement. Especially as regards revolutions and wars, the Church's part is first and foremost, and should always have been that of preserving the spirit of love and brotherhood, of preventing the combatants from forgetting their horror of their own action. The supreme religious treason, the sin against the Holy Ghost, is when the Church abandons its attitude of spiritual revolt, throws in its lot with the state, and requisitions God for war (or revolution) in the name of justice or civilisation.

*
* *

Finally I will attempt to answer the fundamental question: does Christianity condemn war, *all war* ? Here a twofold distinction must be made.

Yes, Christianity does condemn *all war*, in the sense that it leads to an attitude of insurmountable inner opposition : a Christian could *never* consent to take part in massacre. It does not necessarily follow that one should *always* become a conscientious objector. We may condemn an action even while accomplishing it, *if we have only a choice between it and another action, or abstention from action, which is even more condemnable*. If I had been of fighting age in 1914, I believe I would have chosen the civic attitude and — with death in my soul — would have joined in the struggle. And I feel I have no right to criticise Christians who have acted in this way, provided that they have succeeded — even in the thick of the fighting — in keeping their souls pure of all hatred, in idealising nothing, and in suffering horribly from the murders they committed.

But on the other hand, if it is not a question of *any* war, but of *the* war which is threatening to break out in the present economic and political condition of the world with the *actual* means of destruction at our disposal, I agree that as Christians we should not only *condemn* such a war, but should *refuse to take part in it*, for two reasons.

The first reason is, that the civic and practical attitude seems to lead us today to regard conscientious objection as the most effective and least condemnable attitude. War

did indeed appear the lesser evil, when it enabled one — through real but limited suffering — to safeguard the economic existence and the moral heritage of the nation.

But today war is no longer an effective means of national defence. The mere preparations for war — the 103 milliards of military taxes under which the world is groaning — are bringing all the countries to economic crisis and ruin. The moment hostilities broke out, aeroplanes and gas-bombs would destroy the industrial and urban centres in a few days, and the ruined, decimated countries would sink into the anarchy of civil war and would relapse into barbarism. Today war is futile as a means of national defence.

Owing to the atrocious means of destruction, the war would bring inconceivable suffering. We would be fighting not only our aggressors (supposing it were possible to define who *was* the aggressor), but we would be massacring millions of old men, women and innocent children. It would mean an enormous wrong, incomparable with anything the world has ever experienced, and not merely a *lesser* evil.

Finally, war does not even succeed in saving the body of the country, and it is the quickest way to kill its soul. Today it is no longer possible to engage in chivalrous combat, keeping the heart free from any feelings of hatred or violence. Already in 1914 this was difficult, and most of the Churches proved untrue to themselves. It would be quite impossible in the war of tomorrow, which will mean staking *everything*. The struggle for victory will entail putting out all one's energies, stirring up hatred, making the people drunk with slaughter, for if they still retained their sense of good and evil they could not consent to asphyxiate millions of women and children from an invisible aeroplane up above. In a war of this kind the loyal Christian — preserving his inner freedom, praying for his enemies and insisting on the unity of all men in Christ — will be a defeatist, and will have to be put to death to ensure the country's safety. With the methods of warfare at our disposal *today, asking the Christian Church to remain loyal to its message of love and fraternity is really the same thing as asking it to take a stand against war and to refuse all part in it.*

Secondly, the civic attitude of immediate practical results seems, therefore, under the present circumstances, to lead to conscientious objection as the lesser evil ; but that is not all. When we drew a distinction between the two attitudes, the two great general lines of human action, we pointed out that it was not a question of two moral systems, but of two different types of vocation to which God could (according to the period) call individuals, generations or peoples. The question must then be put : are we not today living in a period of human and divine history, when God is inspiring us to be prophets ?

In the life of society there are *organic* periods — to use the words of Saint-Simon — in which all men admit a certain number of common moral principles and accepted values. The essential problem is to translate these principles into action, to embody them in institutions. These periods are the flowering periods of a civilisation (ancient, mediaeval, capitalist, etc.) in which the civic attitude is particularly necessary, and in which the Christian must endeavour, above all by slow and continuous effort, to mould society according to his ideal and to lead it forward step by step.

But there are *critical* periods, when a civilisation is crumbling away, and moral principles are collapsing, when humanity — grown sceptical and lawless — can find no common belief to guide its conduct, and sinks gradually into chaos. At these revolutionary periods the essential thing is no longer the immediate realisation, the improvement of details, but rather the awakening of conscience, the call to repentance, the proclamation of the universal moral values which survive the collapse of human faiths, and to which desperate humanity tries to cling. Today we seem to have entered a period of this kind, and the rôle of Christianity today, cutting itself loose from a lost world, should be to prepare the way for the civilisation of tomorrow by proclaiming, in the midst of suffering and persecution, the message of love and brotherhood. It seems to me, therefore, that today the prophetic attitude — the affirmation of Christian unity by refusing to take part in massacre, is the answer to God's call to our generation and also the most effective and fruitful attitude from the social standpoint.

READERS NOTES

Why so Many Nations ?

... What can Christianity show and effect against the wholesale taking over of racial and national animosities of appalling antiquity, a taking over at which even the youngest nationalities are astonishingly apt and able ? Here, especially, Christianity is so plain and so direct with its quite unescapable facts, that the sole difficulty consists in getting men squarely to front these facts and not steadily to look the other way. The most fundamental of the doctrines specific to Christianity is, doubtless, the doctrine that Jesus Christ is truly God and truly Man. Yet, to become truly man, God had to become Incarnate in a particular human race, short of whatsoever might be sinful in this race. And we know, beyond the possibility of all reasonable challenge, that the race, thus chosen by God for His central condescension, was the Jewish race ; Jesus, as man, is a Jew — a pure Jew. So was His great Precursor, so is His Blessed Mother, so are His Twelve Apostles, with Simon Peter, their Head, and so is the last, yet assuredly not the least, of the Apostles, St. Paul. Soon, it is true, the Greek and the Greek-speaking races, and almost as soon the Italic, the strictly Roman race, come to Christianity, and get from it and give to it infinitely much. Only much later — at earliest with the Goths, some three centuries after the Jews — do the Teutonic races come to Christianity. I do not doubt at all that we are right in believing that very valuable new materials and applications, for and of the Christian spirit and life, were brought also by these races. They had, and they have, the right and the duty of a large place and influence within the religion to which they owe so unspeakable a debt. Yet the greatness, the full adequacy of Christianity to the needs also of our own race, consists precisely in that the various great races — so also the Celtic and the Slavonic — have had their share in the articulation and application of its spirit, and that such great races as the Hindu, the Chinese, and the Japanese will, please God, still come, and, whilst gaining so much themselves, may also give of their specific best.

The greatness of Christianity consists in this its internationality, yet still more in its supernationality. It never can, it never ought

to satisfy just simply what men of this or that particular race and time desire — *that* and nothing else. It must bring, it ought to bring with it, always a surplusage which any one race will not be able, here and now, to work up in any detail. Christianity is extant chiefly to make us grow, and not simply to suit us with clothes fitting exactly to the growth already attained by us.

Aquinas teaches that God, in His creative activity, aims at producing, as nearly as is possible by the sum-total of so many finites, an image of His own infinite richness, and hence that He creates no two leaves, no two insects quite alike — and that, the higher a creature stands in the scale of creation, the more nearly each individual is a species in itself. So, too, so especially in national types, can we believe in, and pray and work for realities precious enough in their particularity to demand our endless care and cultivation. For myself, I am deeply grateful to God that I most truly owe, and that I am keenly aware that I owe, to all the great typical races and nations far too much ever to condemn any one of them root and branch. What, above all, would my religion be without its Jewish figure? What would my theology be without the Greeks? What would my Church Order be without the Italians? How much poorer would be my devotional life without the German *Imitation*! without the French Fénelon! without the Spanish St. Teresa! without the English Mother Julian! I want them all, and I rejoice in them all.

Friedrich von HÜGEL

From "*Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion*", pp. 269-271. Publishers I.M. Dent and Sons, Toronto and London,

Nation and State

The personality of the individual is, at one and the same time, the creation of God and the product of sin; this is true in the same sense of any particular people. Peoples are not platonic ideas, which have once taken form on earth; they are "chance" compositions, in which the creative wealth of individualisation and the effects of the most brutal instincts for power are woven into indissoluble unity. What is true of the individual, is true of the people: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. 51, 5) and "Thou hast covered me in my mother's womb" (Ps. 139, 13). There is no real basis for the romantic glorification of the special

character of one's own people — for in what “sin” was this people of yours born! But there is a reason for grateful acceptance of its collective-historical as well as individual-historical character. Everyone must realise that his citizenship is a vocation sent by God.

The people, inasmuch as it realises itself to be included in the state, is the *nation*; perhaps it is permissible to extend this idea to those peoples which are still in process of striving for unity. The common character demands visible and effective expression in national unity. The nation-state belongs to the organisations which God wants us to create. But as a principle the demand: “A state for every people!” is perfectly senseless. For what is “a people”? Which of the factors: blood, language, culture, common destiny, etc. — is to be the decisive one, since they are never found all together? As soon as one makes a serious experiment with one of these elements, one finds absurdities. Indeed the whole of history would have to be undone if this principle were to be carried out. For history consists of incessant infringements of the principle of nationality, infringements which in their turn lead to the formation of “real nations”; for instance, think of the nation which is perhaps the most united in the world — France! Anyone who conceives the fundamental truths of nationality as based on *theories* is simply thoughtless.

We must, however, not forget that the present-day national-consciousness and the nation-states, which correspond to it, are new facts, and that hence the unifying process of mankind can scarcely stand still at this point. The present-day nation-states represent a half-way house between individualisation and universality. From the standpoint of national individualisation they are Colossi, whose very unwieldiness obstructs this individualising process; their formation rests on necessities which perhaps would no longer exist (in this way) if the larger unity were there. Human nature, as created by God, has powers and needs which are oppressed by this national Colossus: on the one hand they are far too great, on the other hand still too small. The course of history cannot allow their development to stand still; there is an undeniable tendency on the one hand towards absolute universal unity, on the other towards a return to sweeping individualisation, and this tendency is the outcome of historical development. There is no real ground for proclaiming the nation-state (in its present-day greatness and insignificance, in its complete incapacity to unite the common factors, or to give form to the individual ones) as *the* Will of God. One line of reasoning points to the world-state as the goal of historical development; on the other hand, the variety of creative-organic life points to a retrograde movement in the direction of smaller forms of organisation. The

tasks of civilisation and of justice demand the greater unity ; the tasks of the higher culture, of civilisation and of spiritual and moral life demand a more intensive subdivision into smaller forms, with more independence. From both these standpoints, the present nation-states may be regarded as extremely unwelcome half-way houses — a danger both to peace and to culture. The increasing interdependence between nations, as regards the most vital issues, has revealed the national boundaries in many cases to be artificial obstacles, which no longer represent anything real. It is no longer merely "the nation" which has a common destiny, but Europe, even (in a certain sense) the whole of humanity. There is no reason at all why the process of coordination should stop at the national boundaries of the present day, or why the unity of human life should not find expression and effective forms of organisation in a wider kind of community.

It is extremely necessary to point out the danger for cultural life entailed by such centralisation. On the other hand, there is no reason why the opposite process of decentralisation should stop at the boundaries of the nation-states ; there is no reason why it should not go much further back to a revival of that variety and colour which prevailed in the Middle Ages. Centralisation — even the centralisation characteristic of the present nation-states — is always a great danger to culture, and particularism is always a necessity of life. The law of creation points in both directions : towards centralisation and towards separatism, towards the individual and special, and towards the universal. We face the first direction especially in the problem of war, and the second in the relationship of the state to the autonomous forms of co-operation.

Emil BRUNNER

From „Das Gebot und die Ordnungen“, pp. 442-444. Publishers J.B.C. Mohr, Tübingen.

The Christian's Attitude to the State

The paradoxical relation of the Christian to the divinely-created yet sinful world is expressed with special clearness in his unavoidable attitude towards the state. Just as the state has two aspects, so also there are two sides to the attitude of anyone who belongs not only to the civic state but also to the Kingdom of God. Where this is not the case, the Christian faith has either degenerated into sentimentality, or has become secularised. A blind justification of the State, like the idealistic conception of it, is impossible from the

Christian point of view. The very essence of the state is always organised egoism, whether the word "sacred egoism" is known or not; the thing is as old as the state itself, and is found wherever the state is. The state always tends to make itself the absolute authority, whether this be expressed by the English "my country right or wrong", or the German "Deutschland, Deutschland über alles", or in any other nationalist jargon. Because the state has unconditional, superior power over everything within its frontiers, the opinion easily arises that it has *absolute* power and *absolute* rights, that it is "sovereign" in a final, religious sense of the word. It is this claim to unconditional sovereignty which the Christian faith opposes, in the classical words of the Apostle: "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5, 29). There is an innermost "place" where the state has no powers nor rights, the "place" where its relativity is recognised.

Every state maintains and extends its power by means which are, in themselves, morally inadmissible. How should it be otherwise, since the state is the tool of sinful, selfish, worldly forces? The state tends not only to make itself absolute at home, but also to extend its power abroad to an unlimited extent at the expense of others. *Imperialism* has characterised the history of nations ever since the great victor-nations of ancient Oriental times. In the Middle Ages this imperialism assumed a veneer of "Christianity" — the "Holy" Roman Empire, the Crusades; in the Reformation and post-Reformation period it concealed itself under confessional interests; in the 19th century it became shamelessly candid, and would no longer submit to any transcendent power. On the contrary, it set itself up as the Transcendent and Absolute. How could the Christian, through blind, self-assumed acquiescence, say "yes" to this voracious, devilish monster!

But it is just as impossible for the Christian to say "no". He must admit the state to be a necessity, and give thanks for it, in spite of everything, as a gift of God. As we said before, it is just this admission which is a confession of repentance; for Luther's assertion — that the state was necessary for unbelievers but not for believers — is quite wrong. Luther himself came to doubt this distinction; Calvin, with his clear knowledge of men, definitely rejected it. All of us, even Christians, need the state, as a barrier against our own injustice. Whenever Christians, in the exuberance of their faith, thought they could found a communal life without civic obligations, experience has taught them that they were wrong.

The state exists in order to determine our position in the world, as part of our vocation. It is, therefore, a law of service. By

taking our place in the state we become aware, not only of our own sins, but also of God's goodness in allowing us to share in His work. Through the state we can and must render service to our country. No one has the right to refuse this service; on the contrary, in our faith we recognise it as our God-given task to place ourselves at the service of the state, and through the state, of the *people*. But this service cannot be unconditional: complete dedication to the state is forbidden us. Just because the necessity of the state — through all the crises — keeps on making itself so obvious, we as Christians have our particular duty, not in a joyous acquiescence in the state, but in remembering our duties to *all* our brothers over and above our duties to the state, in preserving the limits of civic power (since we realise the great and immediate danger of allowing the state to exceed its authority), in constantly reminding the state that its duty is *service*, and in forcibly opposing its claims if they go too far. We are called — who else is to do it, if the Christians do not! — to protest against all state-absolutism and bureaucracy. Times have changed since the Reformation. At that time the question was to free the state from the grip of the Church; today the problem is how to rescue life from state oppression. Only thus is it not misunderstood, if we also, at a time when state authority itself is in process of decline, vigorously assert the value of this authority, at the same time as opposing bureaucracy and disintegrating individualism.

The times have changed in yet another way: to-day we are responsible for the state, responsible in quite a different way from the ordinary Christians of Luther's time. We no longer live in the age when complete confidence and control were allowed to the Elector or the "strict, responsible Lords" of Zürich, or the Counsellor of Geneva (by which we do not overlook the differences between the republican Swiss cantons and monarchical Germany). For good or evil, *we* bear today all the responsibility, and even those who do not exercise their rights do not thereby relieve themselves of their responsibility. The fact that we often feel the burden too heavy is due to an evil of which we shall have to speak. But as long as this evil exists, we must stick to our posts in order to conquer it.

Emil BRUNNER

From „*Das Gebot und die Ordnungen*“. pp. 446-449. Publishers J.B.C. Mohr, Tübingen,

Deification of the State

The sacramental cloud weighs on the nations. Everywhere the state has erected monuments to the "unknown soldier", heathen altars where, with wreaths in the day-time and candles at night, the nation worships its lost and nameless Self. The people do not realise that every day they are sacrificing themselves more and more to the state. "The people become the flesh and blood, by which the artificial product the machine-state — is nourished. The skeleton is eating up the flesh. The framework of the house has become its owner and inhabitant." (Ortega y Gasset.) Never before has the state been deified with such narrow fanaticism. "Everything for the state, nothing but the state, nothing against the state", cries Mussolini; and Hitler: "The greatness of every powerful organisation, as the embodiment of an idea in this world, lies in the religious fanaticism with which it asserts itself against all other ideas, intolerant, fanatically convinced that it alone is right." And Charles Maurras and his followers serve the "Déesse France" with similar oracular phrases and exorcisms.

Anyone who can still keep his eyes open in the heavy, smoke-laden air which hangs over the western world, sees this irresponsible, dangerous activity with bitterness and shame. He sees on every hand the same rude self-assertion (everyone convinced that *his* morality, *his* race and *his* heroism must be extolled as "superior to all others"); on every hand this mistrust of others, this insincerity between nations, this disorder in domestic affairs, this growth of uncontrollable representatives, this invisible concentration of power, this power of the press and of the catchword, this dark demon of the collective, this wicked playing with fire... All this has assumed such rank proportions only because the truth is hidden by a sacramental cloud. But the icy wind of misery is already blowing over the land. Would that this storm might have a sobering effect on old Europe, enabling it to perceive its own decadence, making the nations at last realise that they are interdependent and cannot deceive one another; so that the individual nation with open eyes may seek its Self and learn at last the difference between spiritual leadership and political administration; so that there may be born a new community, not driven by collective madness, but by a sense of their common need and their common task!

Heads would begin to clear, and the demons to be cast out, if people would at last stop talking about the "well-being and will of

the state". The state is an apparatus. An apparatus has no will, it cannot feel well or ill. Behind such phrases the demon is always lurking. But the *people* can have a will; the people may be in a healthy or unhealthy condition. But one should also be on one's guard against those who speak too easily of the well-being and the will of the *people*. Which members of the people have wills, are discontented? one should immediately ask. And one should not be too quickly satisfied with the answer. One should follow up the question: Are there really any members of the nation who are announcing their will, or are they its rank-grown representatives? Is it really the nation which is ill, or is it certain obscure groups of interests, which are anxious for their own well-being and use the fine word "people" as a cloak for their own propaganda? In Switzerland, when the flags flutter over the *chalets* on Sundays, does it make for the well-being of the nation, or for increased profits from alcohol? In Germany, when the old Germanic gods are dug up, when the masses are electrified, hypnotised, fanaticised by Wagnerian fanfares and theatrical gestures, does that really make for the "spiritual strengthening" of the nation? Does it not rather make for the secret support of hidden profiteers who take advantage of the present situation? And if the French people is worked up by the press into a state of chronic neurosis about security, is it not the all-powerful armaments industry which is pulling the strings behind the scenes? Who pays for the propaganda and who gets the profits? This is what must be asked in every case; in this way the idols are tracked down.

Theophil SPOERRI

From „*Die Götter des Abendlandes*“, pp. 29-30. *Furche-Verlag, Berlin*,

“Among mine own People”

II Kings, 4,13

In spite of all the modern theories about realism, "*Sachlichkeit*" (objectivity) and the like, it becomes more and more obvious that our generation merely knows what it does not want, and hardly ever what it does want. It does not know how to connect these big words with reality, and thus stakes everything recklessly on a different order of things, simply for the sake of their otherness. At bottom we are concerned with the birth of a new form of romanticism which, however loudly it may claim a critical and sober attitude of mind,

differs from the nineteenth century only in that today imagination's garb is not the motley of idealism but the khaki of the vitality-theories. However, the painful divorce between theory and reality cannot be overcome by any anti-theoretical theory, for even the profoundest objections to an over-intellectual and problematic outlook move in this same vacuum of abstract intellectual notions.

A clear symptom of this impotence is the nationalist movement. In a few years' time this movement has grown from the size of a cloud like a man's hand into a hurricane that now sweeps the world and threatens everything with devastation. It is because of this symptomatic character that nationalism to-day requires a hearing and a comprehensive judgment; even apart from its position as a political power, and apart from its claim to fulfil the social and cultural expectations fostered by a former generation — expectations which have since vanished like a dream. This disillusionment must certainly account for the way nationalism has spread in such a short period. More serious still: all this noise of battle conceals a suppressed hunger for life that cries out for satisfaction, conceals also an uncertainty of life, such as the former generation — whether ecclesiastic or positivist in its views — could hardly have understood.

While the nationalist movement is chiefly momentous because of the spiritual desolation and dislocation which it reveals, the movement itself will, of course, never admit these facts. It claims to be positive, to trace back its origin to pre-Christian Teutonic times and to owe its apparent newness only to the fact that Jewish Christianity and Marxist materialism were obscuring it altogether. The obvious truth that one never lives to oneself but always as a member of the collectivity, that one's destiny is closely linked up with the nation, must lead quite naturally to the conviction that this national collectivity should have a primary place in one's life and demand for itself all one's vital interests; that moreover it should affirm itself against everything else, unhampered by moral categories not derived from its own being. The spiritual attitude to which this train of thought must lead is that of the autonomous man, who submits to the demands of the collectivity and who unreservedly acknowledges the authority of the leader, not because of his intellectual or moral superiority, but because he incarnates the intuitive consciousness of the people. Religion is only valued in so far as it is positive; as it unites spirits by a clear system of thoughts and rules, and in so far as it adapts itself to the ideology inspired by this folk-ideal. In practice this leads to glorification of instinctive, even animal man, with all the disastrous consequences, well-known from our newspaper reading. One might expect that no one would need theoretical justification less than these

combatants for the Third Empire. But the contrary is true ! There is an ever-increasing stream of apologetic literature ; from far and near contingents of theories are led to the battlefield. Especially raciology has to pay its tribute. But it is certainly not with great respect that the scientific territory is entered upon ; it is frank prostitution ; everything is used as propaganda. But thus the battle against ideologies becomes itself an ideology. Nationalism grows into a doctrine of racial purity, into a religion of pure-bloodedness, with its culmination in the "myth of the twentieth century" with its violent damnation of meekness and its fanatical apotheosis of the sense of honour. It has become a conception of life, like any other, to be accepted or rejected. But the nationalistic conception is just as powerless as the others to break the circle which severs it from reality.

Let us oppose to this loud talking and preaching about nationalism the answer given by the Shunammite woman to the prophet Elisha as he gratefully offers her his service. What a different atmosphere we are breathing ! Instead of a convulsive thought-complex raised to an absolute, instead of the stifling desert-wind of today, we are struck by the vigorous freshness of a direct sense of life, deep-rooted in the soil of the community, from which it unconsciously draws its sap and to which it offers its fruits. To the question, "Whether there be anything she may wish for ?" she answers simply, "I dwell among mine own people", an answer that seems to deny any sense in the question.

Today man is longing for a sphere of life in which social and national communion are not preached but lived. He is longing for the day, when he will no longer be desperately tortured by the delimitations of rights and rules, as created by the relations between the individual and the community — the axis around which all present-day movements turn. Even here we must be on our guard against romanticism : woe to us if this longing turns us into spectators who indulge in day-dreams and meanwhile let this poor, broken world go to the dogs. But just as much, woe betide us if we are so taken up with the everyday hard struggle for existence that this longing fades, and prophecy is no longer heard in our streets. But where is the missing link between dream and action, so hard to find nowadays ? I believe that here again the Gospel can show the way. What was unconscious as breathing to the Shunammite woman is realised by the great prophets to be part of the surge of social and political evolution. They were not much concerned about personality and community. They knew one thing only : that God is the real point at issue in the life of man and people, that once this truth becomes vital to man, he can no longer cut himself off from the society in

which God Himself placed him. When the individual, as a member of the community, faces God only, all frontier problems that hurt us now will have lost their sting. Social relations will continue to delimit and direct our life, but if it is God who traces frontiers for His children, it must be possible to grow within these precincts. While the air is filled today with national and social ideologies, crying out their impotence, a confrontation with this Bible message seems the only thing that can save us from despair.

N. STUFKENS

From "Faith" (Meditations). Publishers: Erven Y. Bijleveld, Utrecht.

The Ethical Paradox of Patriotism

The social ignorance of the private citizen of the nation has thus far been assumed. It may be reasonable to hope that the general level of intelligence will greatly increase in the next decades and centuries and that growing social intelligence will modify national attitudes. It is doubtful whether it will ever increase sufficiently to eliminate all the moral hazards of international relations. There is an ethical paradox in patriotism which defies every but the most astute and sophisticated analysis. The paradox is that patriotism transmutes individual unselfishness into national egoism. Loyalty to the nation is a high form of altruism when compared with lesser loyalties and more parochial interests. It therefore becomes the vehicle of all the altruistic impulses and expresses itself, on occasion, with such fervor that the critical attitude of the individual toward the nation and its enterprises is almost completely destroyed. The unqualified character of this devotion is the very basis of the nation's power and of the freedom to use the power without moral restraint. Thus the unselfishness of individuals makes for the selfishness of nations. That is why the hope of solving the larger social problems of mankind, merely by extending the social sympathies of individuals, is so vain. Altruistic passion is sluiced into the reservoirs of nationalism with great ease, and is made to flow beyond them with great difficulty. What lies beyond the nation, the community of mankind, is too vague to inspire devotion. The lesser communities within the nation, religious, economic, racial and cultural, have equal difficulty in competing with the nation for the loyalty of its citizens. The Church was able to do so, when it had the prestige of a universality it no longer possesses. Future develop-

ments may make the class rather than the nation the community of primary loyalty. But for the present the nation is still supreme. It not only possesses a police power, which other communities lack, but it is able to avail itself of the most potent and vivid symbols to impress its claims upon the consciousness of the individual. Since it is impossible to become conscious of a large social group without adequate symbolism this factor is extremely important. The nation possesses in its organs of government, in the panoply and ritual of the state, in the impressive display of its fighting services and, very frequently, in the splendors of a royal house, the symbols of unity and greatness, which inspire awe and reverence in the citizen. Furthermore the love and pious attachment of a man to his countryside, to familiar scenes, sights, and experiences, around which the memories of youth have cast a halo of sanctity, all this flows into the sentiment of patriotism; for a simple imagination transmutes the universal beneficences of nature into symbols of the peculiar blessings, which a benevolent nation bestows upon its citizens. Thus the sentiment of patriotism achieves a potency in the modern soul, so unqualified, that the nation is given *carte blanche* to use the power, compounded of the devotion of individuals, for any purpose it desires. Thus, to choose an example among hundreds, Mr. Lloyd George during the famous Agadir Crisis in 1911 in which a European war became imminent, because marauding nations would not allow a new robber to touch their spoils in Africa, could declare in his Mansion House speech: "If a situation were to be forced upon us in which peace could only be preserved by the surrender of the great and beneficent position Britain has won by centuries of heroism and achievement, by allowing Britain to be treated, when her interests were vitally affected, as if she were of no account in the cabinet of nations, then I say emphatically that peace at that price would be a humiliation intolerable for a great country like ours to endure". The very sensitive "honor" of nations can always be appeased by the blood of its citizens and no national ambition seems too base or petty to claim and to receive the support of a majority of its patriots.

Reinhold NIEBUHR

From "Moral Man and Immoral Society". pp. 91-93. Publishers: Charles Scribner's, Sons, New York,

THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

European Nationalisms

No matter where one turns in the world today, whether to Europe, or the Far East, or America, the same picture presents itself — governments and peoples alike are being swept to a catastrophic downfall by this collective madness, nationalism. In Europe, alike in the economic, the political, and the social realms, nationalism is leading a rich and ancient civilisation to suicide.

The manifestations of this mania are not far to seek. The fate of armaments, the continual threat of war, the hate and distrust, with which the nations watch each other, extreme and violent protectionism destroying the very bases of capitalism, reduction of salaries, and the even more implacable oppression of the working classes — these are its fruits.

Moreover, its influences are not confined to political, economic and social life : it is also a moral and intellectual evil. “ The worst results for which nationalism can be blamed ”, said Henri de Man, “ are the havoc wrought to intelligence and reason ”.

Nationalism implies, indeed, a whole set of beliefs, a philosophic system, a moral code, a religion.

In the course of this brief study we do not propose to examine nationalism in all its aspects : a vast bibliography exists on economic and political nationalism. We shall in this article endeavour to describe the chief forms which nationalism takes in Europe today, to review rapidly the nationalistic movements in opposition to one another in the different European countries. For it is true that nationalism rests on antagonisms in intellectual as in economic life : it is impossible to imagine an isolated nationalism standing alone without another opposing nationalism. The essence of nationalistic power is always exclusive. That is a profound truth and one too often lost to view in talk of “ the coalition of European nationalisms ”.

The two Tendencies of Nationalism in Europe

In his famous letter to Mommsen (October 27, 1870) Fustel de Coulange gave a clear and concise definition of “ the principle of

nationalities". "Our principle", he said, "is that a people cannot be governed except by those institutions which they accept freely, and that a people ought to form part of a state only by their own free will and consent". Complete this definition by the final sentence of Renan's famous speech — "A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle" — and you have an exact picture of the idea of nationality — of the rights of nationalities, bequeathed to modern Europe by the French Revolution, and dominating European thought during, and immediately subsequent to the war of 1914. The nationalism which found its sanction in the Wilsonian declaration, the nationalism which was brought into being in Europe by a Masaryk, a Benes, by the Polish emigrants was a *nationalism of freedom*.

It was a question of the aspirations of oppressed peoples to secure their rights, to safeguard their common culture. This nationalism of freedom was identified, so to speak, with the principles of democracy. A small group who met at the *Ecole Normale* in Paris during the war, expounded the following definitions of nation and nationality: "Nation — a community of people occupying a given territory; the nation — a historic and political entity, as distinguished from the race, a natural entity... There is at present no single nation which is made up of one race... This mixing has been brought about by living in the same territory, being grouped under one government, with common memories which have become national tradition and by sharing the same aspirations and having the same mode of life...". "Nationality — each nation constitutes a nationality — but there are nationalities which are not organised into nations, or which having once possessed this organisation, have lost it as a result of accidents of history. Those nationalities now oppressed seek to reconquer the right to live as nations"¹.

We find this nationalism of freedom exemplified today in young countries which have regained their independence since 1918, countries like Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic States, who after a hard struggle have gained the right to their own independent existence. But be it noted that this nationalism no longer corresponds to the political conditions which gave it birth, that today it is not a question of a struggle to regain a place among the free nations, but rather to consolidate and defend that place; and so in the heart of these countries we find the signs of that other tendency in European nationalism, a tendency which we shall call *authoritarian*.

The nationalism of freedom in its pre-war form is to be found today only in the countries of the Far East, who are seeking to free them-

¹ v. Bouglé : *Le Principe des Nationalités et les Minorités Nationales*.
Bulletin de la Dotation Carnegie pour la Paix Internationale, N° 2, 1929.

selves from the western yoke, and among certain national minorities in Europe struggling to safeguard their language and culture and religion.

It is scarcely necessary to give here a detailed analysis of authoritarian nationalism : the Fascist and Hitlerian theses are well known.

This cult of national power creates a fanatical state of mind which cannot be appeased by political victories, whether interior or exterior. Faith in nationalism transcends all national claims. Henri de Man says, that authoritarian nationalism lives by its claims and not for them. On the other hand, the economic factor plays a part of primary importance in the first outburst of authoritarian nationalism. This explains in large measure the movement of the masses which is so frequently covered by it. "Ideals, love, and hunger move individuals ; but it is hunger alone, or practically alone, which determines the great agitations and migrations of peoples"¹.

The Heritage of the Nationalism of Freedom

Nothing can better illustrate the difference between these two tendencies of European nationalism than a comparison between two countries in which it is found. We have had detailed studies of "the Czech solution" and of "the Polish reply"². We shall confine ourselves to presenting the most characteristic points of the situation in the two countries today.

Does a Czechoslovak nationalism exist ? Yes and no ! It is true that national sentiment is very strong, and that a certain national pride is to be found among all classes. But failure attends every effort to change this national sentiment into a nationalist doctrine. Among the university students there is a group with Fascist tendencies, but it is a feeble group with little support in the country. This is due to the fact that from the beginning Masaryk and Benes, and with them the whole country, have understood "that the nationalism of a people who have been humiliated or oppressed is nothing more or less than a necessary evil. It is necessary because all oppression and humiliation can only end in the revolt of the oppressed and humiliated. But it is nevertheless an evil"³.

In Poland the situation is essentially different : the power is in the hands of a nationalist government upheld by the army. But the main opposition party, the national-democratic party, which carries with it the younger elements in the country, represents pure nation-

¹ Lucien Romier : *Nation et Civilisation*. Paris, Kra 1926.

² Henri de Man : *Nationalisme et Socialisme*. L'Eglantine, Bruxelles 1932.

³ Henri de Man. op. cit. p. 59.

alistic doctrine and in some points approaches very near to the German national-socialist party. The racial idea, by which this party is animated, has been the cause of serious anti-semitic troubles — the renaissance of a messianic doctrine makes it impossible for people, speaking different languages and representing different cultures, to live together within the bounds of one state. The national minorities continue to protest and on the same principles which are at the foundation of an independent Poland.

It is true that the development of authoritarian nationalism in Poland and the scope of the national-democratic organisations are explained in large measure by the exigencies of foreign policy, by the feeling of imminent danger on the German-Polish frontier, and by the ever present fear of a new partition. Poland, nevertheless, offers the most striking example of the nationalism of freedom, which has betrayed its own principles in order to incarnate the nationalism which is authoritarian and oppressive. An example of considerable political significance, for there are no hopeful signs that the oriental countries who are today struggling for their independence and whose nationalism has gained European sympathy, will be able to set limits and bring under control in time this unbridled nationalistic passion.

The Baltic countries, and specially Finland come very near to the case of Poland. The nationalist movement, "Lappo", nourished on memories of a struggle for independence, has a very different character. There also the youth of the country are inspired by the mysticism of the strong state, the sovereign nation: "*L'action directe*" preached last year by the leaders of the "Lappo" movement came very near to precipitating civil war. The government had to act with vigour, but the current of extreme nationalism flows strong in Finland today.

Without having this insurrectionist tendency the nationalism of the youth of the other Baltic countries is also authoritarian, and the influence of Fascist ideas is very great.

It is amongst the minorities that the nationalism of freedom is found in its purest form. The Croats of Yugoslavia, half of whose organisations are illegal, give expression to an exasperated nationalism in the face of Serbia's policy of oppression and assimilation. The Ukrainians of Poland and of Czechoslovakia are struggling to reconquer their national and territorial unity. Ukrainian organisations abroad and youth associations ("Cesus" in Prague) carry on a considerable nationalist propaganda. There are many other such groups: and this nationalism of freedom, thus expressed through proclamations and claims, is a source of terror in a Europe striving for peace and unity.

The Homes of Authoritarian Nationalism

The home of dynamic authoritarian nationalism, the first European country to erect the state into a religion, is Fascist Italy. A study of the structure of the Fascist state, its educational system and its foreign policy, is indispensable to an understanding of the profound nature of this form of nationalism. We cannot pursue that study in these pages : we limit ourselves to the enumeration of the main theses of Fascism.

The priority of the national state : "Everything for the state, nothing but the state, nothing against the state" — the motto of Mussolini implies the systematic suppression of all individual effort which cannot be integrated into national politics. The individual, the group, the class disappear : they have no right to existence except so far as the state allows or believes useful "for the accomplishment of its higher mission".

The absolute value of the national state : the will of the state dominates and dissolves individual wills. The state alone proclaims the truth, one and obligatory on all citizens. "In the Fascist régime", said M. Duprat recently, "the citizen has not the right to make a mistake : either he follows the orders given by the state and then he is in the right, or else he has his own way and by so doing is an enemy of the state, an enemy whom the state has the right to exterminate".

The will behind this national power expresses itself in military power. The new Italy proves the impossibility of authoritarian nationalism existing without a vast military organisation. From their earliest years, in the schools, all citizens are mixed together in "the new Fascist army". This moral mobilisation of the nation, the incessant parades and military manœuvres, uniforms and youth groups, are all essential elements in every authoritarian nationalist régime. Italy has brought this military organisation to a high degree of perfection. A "School of Fascist Mysticism" has recently been created in Rome in honour of Arnaldo Mussolini. It will doubtless attract the whole youth of the country in their exalted enthusiasm. "We are", said one of the leaders of young Fascists last year, "the only living force in Europe. Salvation will come from Rome. The world will become Fascist or crumble". Fascist messianism, the refusal to admit limitations of national sovereignty — indispensable for the creation of an international order — are characteristic of Italian youth today, and are found also in the German national-socialist doctrine.

It is true that the mystical and religious elements of nationalism are more accentuated in Germany than in Italy. Chancellor Hitler's recent speeches read like sermons : the national-socialist party is fulfilling the Divine Will, the Germans are the chosen people. The enemies of national-socialism are described as "anti-Christian forces", conquered because God has refused to give them His benediction.

The definition of the nation which we have quoted above places opposite each other the nation as a historical and political entity, and the race as a natural entity. German nationalism identifies the three terms — race, nation, state. Further, the idea of the natural superiority of the Germanic race is deeply rooted in their minds : the solidarity of the Nordic races (Germans, Scandinavians, Dutch, Flemish, English) is a doctrine very dear to the hearts of German youth. A biological basis is also claimed for this racial conception. The protoplasm of the German organism, according to Dr. Wilhelm Stapel, is radically different from that of a Frenchman, a Jew, or a Slav. This eliminates the possibility of any coexistence and collaboration, and necessitates the struggle of which the victory is assured in advance to the German race, as the only one which is really strong and dynamic.

As in Italy, nationalism in Germany has a vast military basis. Hitlerian troops, steel-helmets, youth organisations who are the bearers of the national gospel, these are the incarnation of national power. The "*Zusammen marschieren*" is an essential element in German nationalism.

There are admittedly other elements which play an important rôle in German nationalist doctrine. It wishes to be anti-capitalist. It has successfully made its own many of the tenets of the marxism, which it seeks to exterminate. Events will prove what place in the whole nationalist programme is given to the question of social claims.

We do not wish to prolong this study of German nationalism. An abundant literature in all languages has thrown much light on the origins and present position of this movement. The important work of Mr. Günther Gründel, *Die Sendung der jungen Generation*, gives us much enlightenment on the mysticism of German youth. For a foreigner who is striving to understand events in Germany, there remains something obscure, unintelligible in their nationalistic thought. It may be that it is precisely in this obscure element, this blind faith in abstract and mysterious principles, that the strength of the nationalist movement lies. Physical misery, hunger and unemployment have hurled the masses of Germany into a perilous and obscure adventure.

The Nationalism of the Revolutionaries

After this short glimpse of authoritarian nationalism in the two countries, which have achieved "the national revolution", it is interesting to examine the attitude of Spain and Soviet Russia, revolutionary countries which have given a different orientation to their nationalism.

In Spain the revolution stimulated a real revival of national sentiment. After long struggles against a military dictatorship Spain has rediscovered her youth and vigour : she is ready and anxious to play a new rôle in the modern world. *The Federal Union of Students* took a leading part in the pre-revolutionary period : one of its leaders, who was imprisoned and deported by the Dictator, was amongst the most active agitators and organisers of the revolution. During the dictatorship the prison in Madrid was called the first house in the Cité Universitaire. This nationalism is neither aggressive nor exclusive : on the contrary, it is constructive and moderate, more like that of the Czechoslovak Republic. "What we all want", wrote a young Spanish revolutionary recently, "is a chance to re-organise our country and to raise it to the position to which it has a right in the world and to which the monarchy has failed to raise it. We shall succeed, some by working in political and social organisations, and some in the sphere of technical science". These words seem to us important as throwing light on the particular character of Spanish nationalism. The new Spain is seeking her place in the world by constructive work inside the country. Spanish nationalism is directed inwards not outwards : it seeks to mobilise the moral and material forces of the nation for its own development and not in order to oppose other powers. Also, the autonomy of Catalonia has been realised : it is clear that the future of relations between Catalonia and Spain depends upon the success of the work of social and economic reconstruction. The problem of nationalities does not and will not arise in Spain.

The nationalism, or rather let us say the nationalisms of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics have developed in a similar way. Lenin, writing in 1919, said that the communist revolution had a triple character : in the towns a proletarian revolution of workers in factories and of the army ; in the country a peasant revolution against the feudalism of the "*poméchtiks*"; in short, in all Russia a national revolution of peoples and nationalities oppressed and down-trodden by the Czarist régime.

The awakening of nationalities in that vast Russian territory has been of capital importance — from the small tribes of the Caucasus,

of whose very existence the Czarist Government was ignorant, to the Ukrainians, all demand a wide cultural autonomy, the right to speak their own language and freedom to change their Russified schools into "national" schools. This nationalism of freedom has been integrated into the organisation of the U.S.S.R. ; and far from being in opposition to one another, all the ethnical and national units, making up that organisation, are collaborating in the common task of economic and social reconstruction.

Soviet Russia offers a unique example of how such damned-up nationalisms, well-ordered, may be made into a strength for the whole, instead of being a source of conflict and weakness. It may well be that the surest guarantee of the living force of the Soviet State will be found in their solution of the problem of nationalities¹.

The Nationalism of Inertia

To complete this picture of European nationalisms it remains only to examine the attitude of the two ancient European democracies — France and Great Britain.

"French nationalism" is often quoted abroad as being particularly aggressive and it is used as an example of a bellicose and intransigent nationalism. Political events have a way of giving the lie to erroneous accusations and gross exaggerations far more effectively than anything that can be said or written. It is true that in the economic world France has been drawn with other countries into the practice of protectionist politics at once blind and dangerous. But an examination of the facts shows that if a French nationalism exists, it is indifferent, it lacks the dynamic to be found in Fascism or Hitlerism, it represents essentially a *reaction*. Far from being a new faith, French nationalism is above all an attitude of distrust of new doctrines. This is the interpretation we put on the following passage from the pen of a young nationalist writer : "Nationalism cannot by itself constitute a method of construction of a European order. It simply serves to draw attention to concrete ideas which cannot be ignored. The only order that is possible is an order founded on needs and interests and not on principles". The difference between this declaration and the programme of national-socialism is very striking. It is a question of fundamentally different attitudes. The "doctrinaires" of integral nationalism and the ideologists of national-socialism, may succeed in inspiring some groups of young people,

¹ Pozner, l'URSS, Œuvres représentatives, Paris 1932.

but they have no real influence. There is, however, a certain analogy between the national-socialist attitude in Germany and that of *l'Action Française* : both have broken with the tradition that a good nationalist is out for the re-establishment of a certain feudalism. *L'Action Française*, the party of integral nationalism, takes its stand like the Nazis against industrial feudalism, against the power of banks, etc.

The English situation is very similar to that of France. An Englishman does not like to be treated as a nationalist ; he finds the term rather offensive. Yet, at the same time, his conservative tradition implies a nationalist attitude. True, his nationalism has nothing of Fascism in it : the adventures of Sir Oswald Mosley seem to have little chance of success. And yet, every time that England is confronted with the nationalism of freedom in her colonies and dominions, a conscious and very vigorous nationalism manifests itself immediately in all classes of society.

In England as in France nationalism is calm and apathetic ; but it would be a mistake to under-estimate its strength and importance. We have seen how the young countries of Central Europe changed the nationalism of freedom into a doctrine of authority and an aggressive force. Tomorrow strong nationalist movements may be provoked in France and in England by unforeseen events. Already an economic basis for these exists ; and young socialist writers and thinkers of those countries are right, in drawing attention with ever increasing anxiety to the imminent danger of the present position.

We have come to the end of our study which is necessarily superficial and incomplete. We admit the inadequacy of our analysis and warn our readers against hasty generalisations.

Nationalism is on trial. The present situation in the world is an overwhelming condemnation of the sinister madness which took possession of the nations immediately after the great war. The war consumed moral values as well as material values. The demoralisation of post-war bourgeois society hastened the outburst of these nationalisms. And by an implacable determinism nationalisms will surely produce the complete and final ruin of the bourgeois society which brought them to birth. The conviction of the writer is that the only road to salvation leads away from nationalism and capitalism into international socialism.

M. POBEREZSKI

Social Aspects of Japanese Nationalism

We quote in the following some extracts from a statement by Mr. M. Kakehi on "Nationalistic Movements in Japan; the Present Situation, its Social Significance":

In speaking of the assassination of Premier Inukai on May 15th, last year, I have stated on many occasions that its true significance can be grasped in its relation to the present situation of society and the prevailing trends of thought in Japan, rather than in the external grave appearance of the case in which the Premier of a state was assassinated at his official residence in broad day-light by uniformed navy officers and army cadets.

When it is viewed in that relation, its significance as an epoch-making event has become clear, epoch-making in the sense that since May 15th, 1932, Japanese people have been living in a new and different Japan. In other words, the event has brought to light movements of thought which had either been generally supposed to be mere under-currents or whose importance had been recognised only by those who had been paying special attention to the problems of social thought, and has made them matters of import to all. Before this event to criticise in a fundamental way the present social and economic structure was considered to represent at least a left tendency, but after its occurrence even the conservatives among thinking people have come to recognise the extremely serious situation of present-day Japan and to make such fundamental criticisms of society as to speak of the failure of capitalism and the shortcomings of parliamentarism if not the complete repudiation of them, with the result that this mode of thinking has become commonplace. This remarkable fact was suddenly disclosed to the public that even militarists, who had been thought of as faithful guardians of our present social structure as well as opponents of all new thought, were on the contrary far more advanced in their conception of society than most ordinary people, and that some of them are in the vanguard in the fight for the fundamental reconstruction of society. Left thinkers seem to regard such terrorism as an anachronism based on the combined spirit of feudalism, and misconceived heroism, and as detrimental to the realisation of the ideal of the new society. Apart from its evaluation from the point of view of social science, however, to the common mind it appeared to be an impatient and off-track outbreak of a strong and yet saner reconstruction movement, that

was in keeping with the traditional spirit of the nation and not so remote from existing realities as is communism — a movement which is likely to succeed in saving the nation from present social and political unrest.

As the case is under preliminary legal investigation we are not yet able to have a complete view of it ; but as far as we know, it was not, as people abroad thought at that time, an action based on mere feudalistic terrorism or pre-war nationalism ; especially it was not particularly and chiefly related to Sino-Japanese problems. Some people explain the event as derived from the indignation on the part of military circles in connection with the interference by the civil government with the supreme authority of the army on the occasion of the Naval Treaty of London. This may have helped to ferment such sentiment against the civil government and may have been a contributing cause of that kind of action, but their intention appears to have been directed mainly against present unreasonable and unjust social conditions manifested in the extreme poverty of the rural and labouring population, out of which stratum of society the rank and file of the army come. They had a feeling, of intolerable indignation against our present social and political structure, which is considered to be the cause of all the existing evils, and at the same time a burning zeal for the establishment of an ideal Japan at any cost. Whatever be the underlying causes of the event, our impression was that it should be spoken of not by the old term " assassination " but by the new term " direct action ", which is somewhat associated with the materialistic conception of history, the prevailing mode of thinking today.

Judging from the fragmentary statements given out by the navy and army authorities which appeared in the newspapers, the action was undoubtedly grounded on an extreme type of patriotism rather than on a social theory. To associate the event, therefore, with the basic philosophy of marxism, which stands in the sharpest contrast to any form of patriotism or nationalism, seems entirely out of the question. The possible existence, however, of such an irrational chain of associations — military circles, patriotism, and the materialistic conception of history — to my mind, shows an important and unique phase of present-day Japan. Some thinkers comment on this occurrence as somewhat related to the cut in salaries of government officials, including army and navy officers, carried out by the Hamaguchi Cabinet. I do not have any material at hand to support a denial of such a relationship, but it is surely a near-sighted view to interpret the relationship, if any, as a mere feeling of unrest

with regard to their own living. The question of the interference with the supreme authority of the army, which I mentioned elsewhere in connection with the radical movement in military circles, had also as its background, a strong feeling against the financiers and capitalists who were, it was generally believed, the real power behind the government, and who did not hesitate, it was alleged, to sacrifice the national defence for the sake of their own interests. There we find again the spirit of the times, influenced in a certain sense by the materialistic conception of history. No matter what might have been the starting point or the secondary causes of the event, it seems to me that the only sound interpretation will be to attribute its dominant cause to internal social unrest, which is an important characteristic, according to Professor Sugimori, of the post-war nationalism.

Only in the light of the foregoing statement, I believe, can nationalistic movements in present-day Japan be rightly grasped in their true significance. They are at their best an expression of the earnest and sincere desire to reconstruct present society in such a way as to bring about an ideal condition of national existence, in which every individual in the nation will enjoy an abundance of life spiritually and materially. In order to attain to that state, they believe, the economic resources essential to the national existence should be made secure, and international relations be reconstructed. Whether or not this course will bring the nation to its right destination is the matter to be carefully considered. Extreme and misguided acts have been committed only to help to defeat their own purposes. These considerations, however, do not change my conclusion as to the social significance of the movements. I merely affirm that the nationalistic movements represent one expression. Certainly, there are other expressions of the same earnest and sincere desire for the solution of the life and death problems the Japanese nation is confronting, and they are the movements of social-democrats and reformers in the existing political parties. According to differences in traditional background, the knowledge of science, and the knowledge of society, some are trying to build nationalism, some state or national socialism, some social-democracy, and some democracy pure and simple, on one and the same social situation. The real significance, therefore, lies not in theories, but in social facts. Any movement that can rightly and actually solve the burning problems of the day, no matter on what theory it stands and under what name it comes, will be sure to take the present and future leadership.

Observers abroad often explain the nationalistic movements in Japan as originating in a plot of the military circles, which were

struggling hard before September 18, 1931, to maintain their existence as a privileged class. I consider such a strong assertion on partial knowledge of facts a bold one, but I cannot accept their interpretation; for the facts themselves loudly speak against it. The present social structure is far too complicated to allow such a plot to direct and control any social and political movements, and present social phenomena are too many-sided to be interpreted in such a simple way as to fit in with such an argument. Let us penetrate more deeply into the underlying social facts.

Mitsuaki KAKEHI

THE EDITOR'S TRAVEL DIARY

Leaving Geneva at the beginning of 1933 and arriving in France at the end of 1932 seemed only a timely warning that the New Year would be full of disconcerting and unexpected experiences. In London a short but productive meeting of those "Officers" of the Federation who were en route to Edinburgh: plans for the Java meetings, for the annual student conference in August near Geneva, for many special trips of very special visitors, and last not least a telegraphic resolution of welcome to Fairfax (Virginia) to Francis Pickens Miller, Jr. "Many years and Southern chickens" was a discovery made just before the "Flying Scotsman" took us off to Edinburgh.

Edinburgh

Was there ever a national Student Christian Movement Conference which brought the reality of the Federation more clearly home to its delegates? I doubt it. The generous plan of the British leaders, of enabling two hundred students from other Student Christian Movements to attend the Quadrennial, had met with enthusiastic response. And the programme was definitely international and œcumenical. Hanns Lilje of Germany and T.C. Chao of China gave two of the chief addresses. The sectional meetings were all led by men who were intimately acquainted with the areas under consideration.

Edinburgh gave a clear and definite message characterised by a fine balance of emphasis on the two great commandments. Dr. Oldham's address, which many felt to be the key-note of the whole conference, (let us all read it again and again in the Conference Report) made it marvellously clear that there is no faith in God without faith in man, and no faith in man without faith in God. Was it not this new understanding of the essentials of Christian faith which made it possible for delegates of all countries to feel so thoroughly at home? Somehow it seemed as if the old divisions between Anglo-Saxon and Continental, between social and individual gospel had lost all meaning. The need of our times forces us to think more than ever of the suffering of men and throws us back on God at the same time.

The two questions which seemed to be most on the minds of students were those of our attitude to communism and to war. The first was answered more clearly than the second. The anti-bourgeois utterances of various speakers resulted even in a little storm in the Edinburgh

press. Before long our movements will have to take a pretty strong stand on these questions. The lines are being drawn more sharply between the defenders of things as they are and those who believe that Christianity is per se a judgment of the established order. Let us be grateful for the many signs which show that Christian students are pioneering in disentangling the Christian message from its dangerous alliances.

The Paris Mission

A short visit to Geneva headquarters and off again to Paris with much uncertainty as to the days ahead. Would the courage of the French leaders, in planning such a large-scale approach to the Quartier Latin, be rewarded? Or would it all prove a futile gesture doomed to leave no traces in the sophisticated atmosphere of Paris student life?

The first evening was a great and wonderful surprise. The students did come! The Salle des Sociétés Savantes was well filled. And better still, the third evening on the central subject: "Why are we Christians?" brought a larger attendance than any other meeting. Paris students are seeking for a vital answer to the fundamental questions of life. We learned much during that week. We learned first of all that there is no need to be apologetic about the Christian message and that the time has come for an affirmative evangelism. We learned that we are still very far from presenting the Christian message as it ought to be presented, namely as a "person to person call" rather than as a discussion about God and man. We learned furthermore that we must relate every bit of knowledge of God which we have to pass on to the concrete needs of students — personal, moral, social and political. These students live in real life; they are no longer the "happy youth" outside the main stream of life. An abstract message or a purely individualistic call arouses their suspicion that we have nothing to give but words. It was not by chance that André Philip, with his burning witness to the power of God in a life of social action, made the deepest impression of all.

But the profoundest truth that we learned, all of us, speakers as well as members of the Paris Association, was that as we broke through our isolation and came in living contact with the searching generation of students of our day, we felt a new sense of God's power in human lives, our own as well as those of others and a new responsibility for sharing what God has given to us.

In between the meetings I went to the military prison to see Jacques Martin. As I talked with him about our Mission to the students of

Paris and as I saw the quiet certainty on his face, I recognised that our witness of word was not enough and I thanked God for witnesses like him who speak the most convincing language of Christian obedience.

North America

The ocean is endless, especially in winter-time. But somehow one always arrives on the other side and finds that New York has taken advantage of one's absence to change its sky-line beyond recognition.

One does not expect an easy schedule in this part of the world, but to find that the proposed tempo of speaking and travelling means practically one university and three to five speeches per day with Pullmann-nights in between, is nevertheless always a blow. It just does not seem possible! As one goes on, however, it proves possible. Here I am at Manhattan, Kansas, after 24 days in this cruel country with 61 addresses safely behind me.

The trouble about this "Flying Dutchman business" is that one does not get much of a chance to listen to anybody else but oneself. At the same time student life in this part of the world is certainly not typical or representative of the life of the country as a whole. Only through incidental glimpses, through chance contacts in Pullmanns and on stations does one get a little idea of the realities, the terrible realities beneath the surface. And one wonders how long it will take before the students are psychologically affected by this new and more cruel world which exists around them, but which so few of them seem to have discovered.

There is crisis in America, terrible crisis. The closing of all banks in these last days, the revolt of farmers and miners and unemployed in different places speak a strong language. But there is at the same time still an amazing optimism based on the belief that this crisis will be overcome in the same way as former crises. It is true that there is more realism and that the circle of the radicals is growing. It is true that there is much disillusionment. But, as compared with the rest of the world, American students remain nevertheless amazingly untouched in their old assumptions. Will the crisis have to become much worse before these students begin to get as restless and revolutionary as their colleagues of so many other lands?

It is in the Student Christian Movement that some of the most searching questioning is going on. And it is not only in the economic and political realm. The outstanding impression of these last three weeks is precisely that when I spoke of political and religious currents among students of other lands, it was on the latter subject that students would "bite". I will not easily forget the eager questioning, sometimes going on for hours, about the possibility of any sort of positive faith

in this chaotic world of our time. There is a deep sense of disappointment with the Church and the Christian world in general. And there is a looking out for a new Christian affirmation. The two "events" in the Christian world which are everywhere discussed among leaders and keen students are first the new book of Reinhold Niebuhr and second the Laymen's Missionary Inquiry¹. Niebuhr's frontal attack on the optimistic liberalism of the last decade has acted as a most wholesome challenge to a new Christian realism. Unfortunately neither he nor anyone else has as yet formulated a positive faith to deal with the newly discovered realities. And so Christian students are as yet unable to rally around a definite message for this day of crisis.

The Laymen's Inquiry has resulted in underlining a difficulty which has been felt by many students for quite a few years : Why Christian rather than religious ? Why a World's Student Christian Federation rather than a World's Student Religious Federation ? Here again everything depends on the emergence of a new leadership which will show that commitment rather than vague idealism is the essence of Christianity. Students in this country are very, very young. And they are neither sophisticated nor blasé. (The old "flaming youth" has largely disappeared with prosperity.) The Student Christian Movement has a wonderful opportunity before it. The great question seems to be if it will resolutely go out to help students at their point of deepest need and take advantage of the fact that today students are willing to face fundamental questions.

There are many signs that as the British discovered at Edinburgh, as the French found out at Paris, so the Americans will soon see that the time has come for a new evangelism, which will to some extent differ in content but not in power from the evangelism of the founders of our movement. In Canada Richard Roberts has just been conducting a Mission to the University of Toronto. Everywhere students are ready for something to happen. The world situation grows darker and darker. Thank God, that He has not left us without this ray of hope and encouragement.

V. 't H.

(1) *To both of these we will come back in the next issue.*

BOOK REVIEWS

Nationalism

NATIONALISM, MAN'S OTHER RELIGION. Edward Shillito, M. A.
S.C.M. Press London. 4s and 2s.6d. net.

The purpose of this book is clear from the title. The fact that the Christian religion is growing weak through compromise, is enabling other religions to exist side by side with Christianity, and finally to replace it. This is the case with nationalism, which has been an important spiritual force in Europe for several centuries — a *partial* idolatry, but one which is today tending more and more to take the place of Christianity, and even to challenge it as an adversary. The author gives numerous historical examples of this evolution. He also studies the rise of nationalisms in Asia, similar in certain respects to the European nationalisms born of the Renaissance, but assuming an entirely different aspect and a different dynamic, under the materialist and technical civilisation. An interesting chapter traces the tragedy of Israel, hesitating between these two possibilities : that of being an earthly power and dominating all the other nations ; and that of being the chosen people in order to proclaim the eternal God. What are we to do in this situation ? Firstly, repent of our idolatry of materialism ; then re-model our educational systems and substitute for a negative nationalism a positive, international conception of the nations ; finally, to find in the Church a truly universal and catholic community. But for this the Church must not allow itself to be exploited by the state or the nation ; it must proclaim freely the message which God gives it, “this voice addressed to all the nations of the world”.

This simple, clear work, illustrated with many historical examples, is a good exposition of the principal problems raised by nationalism.

P. M.

English Catholicism

CATHOLICITY, by Herbert H. Kelly, S.S.M., *Student Christian Movement Press, London. Price 4/10.*

INTERCOMMUNION, by A. G. Hebert, M.A., S.S.M., *Published by Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London. Price 2/-.*

Anglican religious orders are very little known outside England, and yet, although they are comparatively small bodies, they have their own prominent place in the development of Western Monasticism.

The books, mentioned above, are written by two leading members of one of the English Monastic Communities, called the Society of the Sacred Mission. It is, however, better known, at least in England, under the name of Kelham, the place where it has a large theological college and its headquarters. These two books certainly merit the attention of all those who are interested in the relationships between the Protestants and the Catholics. Their main purpose is to explain the position for which the Catholic members of the Anglican Church stand, and one has to admit that it is not only a very able and carefully drawn account, but also a most sincere attempt to meet seriously the objections and criticisms of Protestants. It is possible that most of the non-English readers will be astonished to find that Anglican monks are more prepared to admit quite frankly the failures and mistakes of the Catholic party in the Church of England than many lay members of the same Church would be ready to do. The word "monk" is often associated in the minds of Protestants with the most rigid and conservative forms of Christian thought and worship. The reading of these books will show that this is a misconception. Both Father Kelly and Father Hebert are men of admirable open-mindedness and self-criticism.

And yet they are real Catholics, imbued with the best traditions of this stream of Christian life, deeply convinced of its truth, and desirous of enriching the experience of other Christians with their own vision of the Church. The method which they have chosen is undoubtedly the only one which can lead Christians to real mutual understanding, i.e., it is a frank criticism of oneself and a readiness to learn from others. It is particularly interesting to see that Father Hebert is in sympathy with the main outline of the South India Scheme, which represents a daring attempt at re-uniting a body of Anglicans and Protestants, but which is usually severely criticised by other Catholic members of the Anglican Church. It is to be hoped that many students, belonging to the various Reformed Churches, will carefully read these books in order to understand better the position of the Catholic Christians.

N. Z.

The Roman Catholic Church

LA CHIESA ROMANA. Prof. E. Buonaiuti. *Gilardi e Noto, Milano*, 1933. Price, Lira 12.

May we draw the attention of all students of œcumenic questions to this book, written with great feeling and with a constant regard for truth. Although he has been excommunicated by his Church, Prof. Buonaiuti's attitude to the Church is always one of respect and devotion, which makes this work especially interesting and pleasing. The author undertakes to examine and describe the essential aspects of the Roman Church, both from the aspect of its doctrine, and from that of its historical development. The work is divided into five chapters : What the Roman Church claims to be, What it has been, What it is, What it could be, What it will be. The author, in accordance with his passionate temperament, goes into a thorough defence of the function and fundamental values of Roman Catholicism ; it is a heroic and admirable defence, if one thinks of all that Prof. Buonaiuti must have suffered at the hands of the Church authorities. But that has not withheld him, *magis amica veritas*, from severe and ruthless criticism of its decadent aspects, especially the spirit and influence of the Jesuits, whom the author regards as habitually denying the fundamental values of the religious spirit. Even in the negative aspect of the book, however, one perceives a constant effort to rise above petty controversy into the purely spiritual realm. Some pages are not easy to grasp, and force the reader to wander through a complicated dialectic of technical words and expressions, which requires special preparation. The book is not written with a purely informative purpose, but in order to make the reader reflect on the destiny and responsibility of the Roman Church — one might add, the whole Church — at this epoch of confusion. We wish this work the success which it deserves, and hope that it will soon appear in translations which will render it accessible to a larger public.

A. S.

Notes on Contributors and Articles

HANNS LILJE is Vice-President of the W.S.C.F. and General Secretary of the German S.C.M. He is the author of *Das Technische Zeitalter* and *Luthers Geschichtsanschauung*.

CHARLES WESTPHAL is General Secretary of the French S.C.M. and a member of the General Committee of the W.S.C.F. His article as well as that of Pastor Lilje are based on lectures addressed to the General Committee at Zeist, last summer.

M.C. SLOTEMAKER DE BRUINE is Bible Study Secretary of the Dutch S.C.M. and a member of the General Committee of the W.S.C.F. He is one of the "Special Federation Workers" and in this capacity recently visited the movements in Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary and Transsylvania.

EMANUEL RADL is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Prague. Of his many works only a few have been translated, we mention *Der Kampf der Tschechen und Deutschen* and *The History of Biological Theories*. Prof. Radl is President of the National Committee of the Czech Y.M.C.A. and one of the most active friends of the Czech S.C.M.

A.I. NIKITIN is General Secretary of the Russian S.C.M. Outside Russia, he was for many years General Secretary of the Bulgarian S.C.M.

REV. H.C. BALASUNDARUM is Secretary of the North Indian Branch of the British and Foreign Bible Society with headquarters in Allahabad. He was for many years Secretary of the National Y.M.C.A. in South India.

ANDRÉ PHILIP is Professor of Law at Lyon University and a leader of the Socialist Party in France. He is a well-known lecturer in France and the United States. Among his many books we mention the following : *Le Christianisme et la Paix, Sécurité et Désarmement, L'Inde Moderne, Le Problème ouvrier aux Etats-Unis, L'Angleterre moderne, H. de Man et la Crise doctrinale du Socialisme, Guild Socialisme et Trade Unionisme, Le Recours pour Excès de Pouvoirs et l'Activité Coopérative*.

MICHEL POBEREZSKI is Assistant General Secretary of International Student Service. He is a member of the Socialist Party.

MITSUAKI KAKEHI has been until recently General Secretary of the Japanese S.C.M. He is already well-known to our *Student World* readers through former articles on Japan.

The writers of the *Book Reviews* are : Nicholas Zernoff (Special Federation Worker, and also closely related with the British S.C.M. and the Russian S.C.M. Outside Russia), Alberto Sibille (Secretary of the Y.M.C.A. in Rome) and Pierre Maury.

Errata in Last Number. Book Review "Im Ringen um den Geist" page 90, line 15, should read *Kreismittelpunkt* instead of *Kriegsmittelpunkt*.
